

nature of Brahman. The Brahman is Śrī Kṛṣṇa, who is omniscient, omnipotent, the ultimate cause, and the all-pervading Being. Such a Being can be realized only through a constant effort to permeate oneself with His nature by means of thought and devotion. The import of the first aphorism of the *Brahma-sūtra* consists in the imposition of such a duty on the devotee, namely, the constant effort at realizing the nature of Brahman<sup>1</sup>. The pupil listens to the instruction of his teacher who has a direct realization of the nature of Brahman and whose words are therefore pregnant with his concrete experience. He tries to understand the import and meaning of the instruction of his teacher which is technically called *śravaṇa*. This is indeed different from the ordinary accepted meaning of the *śravaṇa* in the Śāṅkara literature where it is used in the sense of listening to the Upaniṣadic texts. The next step is called *manana*—the process of organizing one's thought so as to facilitate a favourable mental approach towards the truths communicated by the teacher in order to rouse a growing faith in it. The third step is called *nididhyāsana*—the process of marshalling one's inner psychical processes by constant meditation leading ultimately to a permanent conviction and experiences of the truths inspired and communicated by the teacher. It is the fruitful culmination of the last process that brings about the realization of the nature of Brahman. The study of the nature of the Vedic duties, technically called *dharma*, and their inefficacy, rouses a desire for the knowledge of the nature of Brahman leading to eternal bliss. As a means to that end the pupil approaches the teacher who has a direct experience of the nature of Brahman. The revelation of the nature of the Brahman in the pupil is possible through a process of spiritual communication of which *śravaṇa*, *manana* and *nididhyāsana* are the three moments.

According to Nimbārka's philosophy which is a type of *Bhedā-bheda-vāda*, that is, the theory of the Absolute as Unity-in-difference, Brahman or the Absolute has transformed itself into the world of matter and spirits. Just as the life-force or *prāṇa* manifests itself into the various conative and cognitive sense-functions, yet keeps its own independence, integrity and difference from them,

<sup>1</sup> As the nature of this duty is revealed through the text of the *Brahma-sūtra*, namely, that the Brahman-hood can be attained only by such a process of *nididhyāsana*, it is called the *apūrva-vidhi*.

so the Brahman also manifests itself through the numberless spirits and matter without losing itself in them. Just as the spider spins out of its own self its web and yet remains independent of it, so the Brahman also has split itself up into the numberless spirits and matter but remains in its fullness and purity. The very existence and movement of the spirits and indeed all their operations are said to depend upon Brahman (*tad-āyatta-sthiti-pūrvikā*) in the sense that the Brahman is both the material and the determining cause of them all<sup>1</sup>.

In the scriptures we hear of dualistic and monistic texts, and the only way in which the claims of both these types of texts can be reconciled is by coming to a position of compromise that the Brahman is at once different from and identical with the world of spirits and matter. The nature of Brahman is regarded as such that it is at once one with and different from the world of spirits and matter, not by any imposition or supposition, but as the specific peculiarity of its spiritual nature. It is on this account that this *Bhedā-bheda* doctrine is called the *svābhāvika bhedā-bheda-vāda*. In the pure dualistic interpretation of the Vedānta the Brahman is to be regarded only as the determining cause and as such the claims of all texts that speak of the Brahman as the material cause or of the ultimate identity of the spirits with the Brahman are to be disregarded. The monistic view of the Vedānta is also untenable, for a pure differenceless qualityless consciousness as the ultimate reality is not amenable to perception, since it is super-sensible, nor to inference, since it is devoid of any distinctive marks, nor also to scriptural testimony, as no words can signify it. The supposition that, just as one's attention to the moon may be drawn in an indirect manner by perceiving the branch of a tree with which the moon may be in a line, so the nature of Brahman also may be expressed by demonstrating other concepts which are more or less contiguous or associated with it, is untenable; for in the above illustration the moon and the branch of the tree are both sensible objects, whereas Brahman is absolutely super-sensible. Again, if it is supposed that Brahman is amenable to logical proofs, then also this supposition would be false; for all that is amenable to proofs or subject to any demonstration is false. Further, if it is not amenable to any proof, the Brahman would be chimerical as the

<sup>1</sup> Śrinivāsa's commentary on Nimbārka's *Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha* on *Brahma-sūtra*, I. i. 1-3.

hare's horn. If it is held that, Brahman being self-luminous, no proofs are required for its demonstration, then all the scriptural texts describing the nature of Brahman would be superfluous. Moreover, the pure qualityless Brahman being absolutely un-associated with any kind of impurity has to be regarded as being eternally free from any bondage, and thus all scriptural texts giving instruction in the methods for the attainment of salvation would be meaningless. The reply of the Śāṅkarites, that all duality though false has yet an appearance and serves practical purposes, is untenable; for when the scriptures speak of the destruction of bondage they mean that it was a real bondage and its dissolution is also a real one. Again, an illusion is possible in a locus only when it has some specific as well as some general characters, and the illusion takes place only when the object is known in a general manner without any of its specific attributes. But if the Brahman is absolutely qualityless, it is impossible that it should be the locus of any illusion. Again, since it is difficult to explain how the *ajñāna* should have any support or object (*āśraya* or *viśaya*), the illusion itself becomes inexplicable. The Brahman being of the nature of pure knowledge can hardly be supposed to be the support or object of *ajñāna*. The *jīva* also being itself a product of *ajñāna* cannot be regarded as its support. Moreover, since Brahman is of the nature of pure illumination and *ajñāna* is darkness, the former cannot legitimately be regarded as the support of the latter, just as the sun cannot be regarded as the supporter of darkness.

The operation that results in the formation of illusion cannot be regarded as being due to the agency of *ajñāna*, for *ajñāna* is devoid of consciousness and cannot, therefore, be regarded as an agent. The agency cannot also be attributed to Brahman because it is pure and static. Again, the false appearance of Brahman as diverse undesirable phenomena such as a sinner, an animal, and the like, is inexplicable; for if the Brahman is always conscious and independent it cannot be admitted to allow itself to suffer through the undesirable states which one has to experience in various animal lives through rebirth. If the Brahman has no knowledge of such experiences, then it is to be regarded as ignorant and its claim to self-luminosity fails. Again, if *ajñāna* is regarded as an existent entity, there is the change to dualism, and if it is regarded as non-existent then it cannot hide the nature of Brahman. Further, if

Brahman is self-luminous, how can it be hidden and how can there be any illusion about it? If the conch-shell shines forth in its own nature, there cannot be any misperception of its nature as a piece of silver. Again, if the nature of Brahman is admitted to be hidden by *ajñāna*, the question that naturally arises is whether the *ajñāna* veils the nature of the Brahman as a whole or in part. The former supposition is impossible, for then the world would be absolutely blind and dark (*jagad-āndhya-prasaṅgāt*), and the latter is impossible, for the Brahman is a homogeneous entity and has no characters or parts. It is admitted by the monists to be absolutely qualityless and partless. If it is held that ordinarily only the "bliss" part of the Brahman is hidden by *ajñāna* whereas the "being" part remains unveiled, then that would mean that Brahman is divisible in parts and the falsity of the Brahman would be demonstrable by such inferences as: Brahman is false, because it has parts like the jug (*brahma mithyā sāmśatvāt, ghaṭādivat*).

In reply to the above objections it may be argued that the objections against *ajñāna* are inadmissible, for the *ajñāna* is absolutely false knowledge. Just as an owl perceives utter darkness, even in bright sunlight, so the intuitive perception "I am ignorant" is manifest to all. Anantarāma, a follower of the Nimbārka school, raises further objections against such a supposition in his *Vedānta-tattva-bodha*. He says that this intuitively felt "I" in "I am ignorant" cannot be pure knowledge, for pure knowledge cannot be felt as ignorant. It cannot be mere egoism, for then the experience would be "the egoism is ignorant." If by "ego" one means the pure self, then such a self cannot be experienced before emancipation. The ego-entity cannot be something different from both pure consciousness and *ajñāna*, for such an entity must doubtless be an effect of *ajñāna* which cannot exist before the association of the *ajñāna* with Brahman. The reply of the Śāṅkarites that *ajñāna*, being merely false imagination, cannot affect the nature of the Brahman, the abiding substratum (*adhiṣṭhāna*), is also inadmissible; for if the *ajñāna* be regarded as false imagination there must be someone who imagines it. But such an imagination cannot be attributed to either of the two possible entities, Brahman or the *ajñāna*; for the former is pure qualityless which cannot therefore imagine and the latter is inert and unconscious and therefore devoid of all imagination. It is also wrong to suppose that Brahman

as pure consciousness has no intrinsic opposition to *ajñāna*, for there can be no knowledge which is not opposed to ignorance. Therefore the Śāṅkarites are not in a position to demonstrate any entity which they mean by the intuition "I" in "I am ignorant."

The final conclusion from the Nimbārka point of view therefore is that it is inadmissible to accept any *ajñāna* as a world-principle producing the world-appearance by working in co-operation with the Brahman. The *ajñāna* or ignorance is a quality of individual beings or selves who are by nature different from Brahman but are under its complete domination. They are eternal parts of it, atomic in nature, and are of limited powers. Being associated with beginningless chains of *karma* they are naturally largely blinded in their outlook on knowledge<sup>1</sup>.

The Śāṅkarites affirm that, through habitual failure in distinguishing between the real nature of the self and the not-self, mis-perceptions, misapprehensions and illusions occur. The objection of Anantarāma against such an explanation is that such a failure cannot be attributed either to Brahman or to *ajñāna*. And since all other entities are but later products of illusion, they cannot be responsible for producing the illusion<sup>2</sup>.

In his commentary Śāṅkara had said that the pure consciousness was not absolutely undemonstrable, since it was constantly being referred to by our ego-intuitions. To this the objection that naturally arises is that the entity referred to by our ego-intuitions cannot be pure consciousness; for then the pure consciousness would have the characteristic of an ego—a view which is favourable to the Nimbārka but absolutely unacceptable to the Śāṅkarites. If it is held to be illusory, then it has to be admitted that the ego-intuition appears when there is an illusion. But by supposition the illusion can only occur when there is an ego-intuition<sup>3</sup>. Here is then a reasoning in a circle. The defence that reasoning in a circle can be avoided on the supposition that the illusory imposition is beginningless is also unavailing. For the supposition that illusions as such are beginningless is false, as it is well known that illusions

<sup>1</sup> *paramā-tma-bhinno' lpa-śaktis tad-adhīnaḥ sanātanas tad-amśa-bhūto' nādi-karmā-tmikā-vidyā-ṛta-dharma-bhūtā-jñāno jīva-kṣetrajñā-di-tadbā-bhīdheyaḥ tat-pratyayā-śraya iti. Vedānta-tattva-bodha, p. 12.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid. p. 13.*

<sup>3</sup> *adhyastattve tu adhyāse sati bhāsamānatvam, tasmin sati sa ity anyonyā-śraya-doṣaḥ. Ibid. p. 14.*

are possible only through the operation of the subconscious impressions of previous valid cognitions<sup>1</sup>. Again, the reflection of the pure consciousness in the *ajñāna* is impossible, for reflections can take place only between two entities which have the same order of existence. From other considerations also the illusion has to be regarded as illegitimate. Illusions take place as the result of certain physical conditions such as contact, defect of the organs of perception, the operation of the subconscious impressions, etc. These conditions are all absent in the supposed case of the illusion involved in the ego-intuition.

The Śāṅkarites described *māyā* as indefinable. By "indefinable" they mean something that appears in perception but is ultimately contradicted. The Śāṅkarites define falsehood or non-existence as that which is liable to contradiction. The phenomena of *māyā* appear in experience and are therefore regarded as existent. They are liable to contradiction and are therefore regarded as non-existent. It is this unity of existence and non-existence in *māyā* that constitutes its indefinability. To this Anantarāma's objection is that contradiction does not imply non-existence. As a particular object, say a jug, may be destroyed by the stroke of a club, so one knowledge can destroy another. The destruction of the jug by the stroke of the club does not involve the supposition that the jug was non-existent. So the contradiction of the prior knowledge by a later one does not involve the non-existence or falsity of the former. All cognitions are true in themselves, though some of them may destroy another. This is what the Nimbārkists mean by the *sat-khyāti* of knowledge. The theory of *sat-khyāti* with them means that all knowledge (*khyāti*) is produced by some existent objects, which are to be regarded as its cause (*sad-dhetukā khyāti*, *sat-khyāti*). According to such a view, therefore, the illusory knowledge must have its basic cause in some existent object. It is wrong also to suppose that false or non-existent objects can produce effects on the analogy that the illusory cobra may produce fear and even death. For here it is not the illusory cobra that produces fear but the memory of a true snake. It is wrong therefore to suppose that the illusory world-appearance may be the cause of our bondage.

Since illusions are not possible, it is idle to suppose that all our

<sup>1</sup> *adhyāso nā'nādīh, pūrva-pramā-hita-samūhāra-janyatvāt. Vedānta-tattva-bodha*, p. 14.

perceptual, inferential, and other kinds of cognitions are produced as associated with an ego through sheer illusion. Right knowledge is to be regarded as a characteristic quality of the self and the production of knowledge does not need the intervention of a *vr̥tti*. The *ajñāna* which prevents the flashing in of knowledge is our *karma* which is in accumulation from beginningless time. Through the operation of the sense-organs our selves expand outside us and are filled with the cognition of the sense-objects. It is for this reason that when the sense-organs are not in operation the sense-objects do not appear in cognition, as in the state of sleep. The self is thus a real knower (*jñātā*) and a real agent (*kartā*), and its experiences as a knower and as an agent should on no account be regarded as the result of a process of illusion<sup>1</sup>.

The self is of the nature of pure consciousness, but it should yet be regarded as the real knower. The objection that what is knowledge cannot behave in a different aspect as a knower, just as water cannot be mixed with water and yet remain distinct from it, is regarded by the Nimbārkaists as invalid. As an illustration vindicating the Nimbārka position, Puruṣottama, in his *Vedānta-ratna-mañjuṣā*, refers to the case of the sun which is both light and that from which light emanates. Even when a drop of water is mixed with another drop the distinction of the drops, both quantitative and qualitative, remains, though it may not be so apprehended. The mere non-apprehension of difference is no proof that the two drops have merged into identity. On the other hand, since the second drop has its parts distinct from the first one it must be regarded as having a separate existence, even when the two drops are mixed. The character as knower must be attributed to the self; for the other scheme proposed by the Śāṅkarites, that the character as knower is due to the reflection of the pure consciousness in the *vr̥tti*, is inefficacious. The sun that is reflected in water as an image cannot be regarded as a glowing orb by itself. Moreover, reflection can only take place between two visible objects; neither pure consciousness nor the *antaḥkaraṇa-vr̥tti* can be regarded as visible objects justifying the assumption of reflection.

The ego-intuition refers directly to the self and there is no illusion about it. The ego-intuition thus appears to be a continuous revelation of the nature of the self. After deep dreamless sleep one

<sup>1</sup> *Vedānta-tattva-bodha*, p. 20.

says "I slept so well that I did not know even myself." But this should not be interpreted as the absence of the ego-intuition or the revelation of the self. The experience "I did not know myself" refers to the absence of the intuition of the body and the mental psychosis, but it does not indicate that the self-conscious self had ever ceased to shine by itself. The negation involved in the denial of the perception of one's self during dreamless sleep refers to the negation of certain associations (say, of the body, etc.) with which the ego ordinarily links itself. Similar experience of negation can also be illustrated in such expressions as "I was not so long in the room," "I did not live at that time," etc., where negations refer to the associations of the ego and not to the ego. The self is not only to be regarded as expressed in the ego-intuition, but it is also to be regarded as distinct from the knowledge it has. The perception of the self continues not only in the state of dreamless sleep but also in the state of emancipation, and even God in His absolute freedom is conscious of Himself in His super-ego intuition. He is also all-Merciful, the supreme Instructor, and the presiding deity of all our understanding. Like individual selves God is also the agent, the creator of the universe. If the Brahman were not an agent by nature, then He could not have been the creator of the universe, even with the association of the *māyā* conditions. Unlike Brahman the activity of the individual souls has to depend upon the operation of the conative organs for its manifestation. The self also really experiences the feelings of pleasure and pain. The existence and agency of the human souls, however, ultimately depend on the will of God. Yet there is no reason to suppose that God is partial or cruel because He makes some suffer and others enjoy; for He is like the grand master and Lord who directs different men differently and awards suffering and enjoyment according to their individual deserts. The whole idea is that though God awards suffering and enjoyment to individuals and directs their actions according to their deserts, He is not ultimately bound by the law of *karma*, and may by His grace at any time free them from their bondage. The law of *karma* is a mechanical law and God as the superintendent decides each individual case. He is thus the dispenser of the laws of *karma* but is not bound by it<sup>1</sup>. The human souls are a part of the

<sup>1</sup> *na vayan brahma-niyantṛtvasya karma-sāpekṣattvaṃ brūmah, kintu puṇyā-di-karma-kārayitṛtve tat-phala-dātṛtve ca. Vedānta-ratna-mañjūṣā, p. 14.*

nature of God and as such are dependent on Him for their essence, existence, and activities (*tad-āyatta-svarūpa-sthiti-pūrvikāḥ*). God being the ultimate truth, both the human souls and inanimate nature attain their essence and existence by virtue of the fact that they are parts of Him and participate in His nature. They are therefore entirely dependent on Him for their existence and all their operations.

The individual souls are infinite in number and atomic in size. But though atomic in size they can at the same time cognize the various sensations in various parts of the body through all-pervading knowledge which exists in them as their attribute. Though atomic and partless in their nature, they are completely pervaded by God through His all-pervading nature. The atomic souls are associated with the beginningless girdle of *karma* which is the cause of the body, and are yet through the grace of God finally emancipated when their doubts are dissolved by listening to the instructions of the *śāstras* from the teachers, and by entering into a deep meditation regarding the true essence of God by which they are ultimately merged in Him. God is absolutely free in extending His mercy and grace. But it so happens that He actually extends them to those who deserve them by their good deeds and devotion. God in His transcendence is beyond His three natures as souls, the world and even as God. In this His pure and transcendent nature He is absolutely unaffected by any changes, and He is the unity of pure being, bliss and consciousness. In His nature as God He realizes His own infinite joy through the infinite souls which are but constituent parts of Him. The experiences of individuals are therefore contained in Him as constituents of Him because it is by His own *ikṣaṇa* or self-perceiving activity that the experiences of the individual selves can be accounted for. The existence and the process of all human experience are therefore contained and controlled by Him. The individual selves are thus in one sense different from Him and in another sense but constituent parts of Him. In Bhāskara's philosophy the emphasis was on the aspect of unity, since the differences were due to conditions (*upādhi*). But though Nimbārka's system is to be counted as a type of *Bhedā-bheda* or *Dvaitā-dvaita* theory, the emphasis here is not merely on the part of the unity but on the difference as well. As a part cannot be different from the whole, so the individual souls can never be dif-

ferent from God. But, in the state of bondage the individuals are apt to forget their aspects of unity with God and feel themselves independent in all their actions and experiences. When by absolute self-abnegation springing from love the individual feels himself to be absolutely controlled and regulated by God and realizes himself to be a constituent of Him, he loses all his interests in his actions and is not affected by them. The ultimate ideal, therefore, is to realize the relation with God, to abnegate all actions, desires and motives, and to feel oneself as a constituent of Him. Such a being never again comes within the grasp of mundane bondage and lives in eternal bliss in his devotional contemplation of God. The devotee in the state of his emancipation feels himself to be one with God and abides in Him as a part of His energy (*tat-tādātmyā-nubhava-pūrvakam viśvarūpe bhagavati tac-chaktyā-tmanā avasthānam*)<sup>1</sup>. Thus, even in the state of emancipation, there is a difference between the emancipated beings and God, though in this state they are filled with the utmost bliss. With the true realization of the nature of God and one's relation with Him, all the three kinds of *karma* (*sañcita*, *kriyamāṇa* and *ārabdha*) are destroyed<sup>2</sup>. *Avidyā* in this system means ignorance of one's true nature and relationship with God which is the cause of his *karma* and his association with the body, senses and the subtle matter<sup>3</sup>. The *prārabdha karma*, or the *karma* which is in a state of fructification, may persist through the present life or through other lives if necessary, for until their fruits are reaped the bodiless emancipation cannot be attained<sup>4</sup>. Sainthood consists in the devotional state consisting of a continual and unflinching meditation on the nature of God (*dhyāna-paripākena dhruva-smṛti-para-bhakti-ākhyā-jñānā-dhigame*). Such a saint becomes free from the tainting influence of all deeds committed and collected before and all good or bad actions that may be performed later on (*tatra uttara-bhāvināḥ kriyamāṇasya pāpasya āśleṣaḥ tat-prāg-bhūtasya sañcitasya tasya nāśaḥ. Vedānta-kaustubha-prabhā*, IV. 1. 13). The regular caste duties and the duties of the various stages of life help the rise of wisdom and ought therefore always to be performed, even when the wisdom has arisen; for the flame of

<sup>1</sup> *Para-pakṣa-giri-vajra*, p. 591.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 598.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *viduṣo vidyā-māhātmyāt sañcita-kriyamāṇayor āśleṣa-vināśau, prārabdhasya tu karmaṇo bhogena vināśaḥ, tatra prārabdhasya etac charitreṇa itara-śatirair vā bhuktvā vināśān-mokṣa iti samkṣepaḥ. Ibid.* p. 583.

this light has always to be kept burning (*tasmāt vidyo-dayāya svā-śrama-karmā-gnihotrā-di-rūpaṃ gr̥hasthena, tapo-japā-dīni karmāṇi ūrdhva-retobhir anuṣṭheyāni iti siddham*). But the conglomeration of deeds which has started fructifying must fructify and the results of such deeds have to be reaped by the saint either in one life or in many lives as the case may be. The realization of Brahman consists in the unflinching meditation on the nature of God and the participation in Him as His constituent which is the same thing as the establishment of a continuous devotional relationship with Him. This is independent of the ontological fusion and return in Him which may happen as a result of the complete destruction of the fructifying deeds (*prārabdha karma*) through their experiences in the life of the saint (*vidyā-yoni-śarīra*) or in other lives that may follow. A saint, after the exhaustion of his fructifying deeds, leaves his gross body through the *suṣumnā* nerve in his subtle body, and going beyond the material regions (*prākṛta-maṇḍala*) reaches the border region—the river *virajā*—between the material regions and the universe of *Viṣṇu*<sup>1</sup>. Here he leaves aside his subtle body in the supreme being and enters into the transcendent essence of God (*Vedānta-kaustubha-prabhā*, IV. 2. 15). The emancipated beings thus exist in God as His distinct energies and may again be employed by Him for His own purposes. Such emancipated beings, however, are never sent down by God for carrying on an earthly existence. Though the emancipated beings become one with God, they have no control over the affairs of the world, which are managed entirely by God Himself<sup>2</sup>.

Though it is through the will of God that we enjoy the dream experiences and though He remains the controller and abides in us through all stages of our experiences, yet He is never tainted by the imperfections of our experiential existence (*Vedānta-kaustubha* and its commentary *Prabha*, III. 2. 11). 'The objects of our experiences are not in themselves pleasurable or painful, but God makes them so to us in accordance with the reward and punishment due to us according to our good or bad deeds. In themselves the objects are

<sup>1</sup> *para-loka-gamane dehād utsarpaṇa-samaye eva viduṣaḥ puṇya-pāpe nira-vaśeṣaṃ kṣiyate, . . . vidyā hi sva-sāmarthyād eva sva-phala-bhūta-brahma-prāpti-pratipādanāya . . . enaṃ deva-yānena pathā gamayitum sūkṣma-śarīraṃ sthāpayati. Vedānta-kaustubha-prabhā*, III. 3. 27.

<sup>2</sup> *muktasya tu para-brahma-sādharmye'pi nikhila-cetanā-cetana-patitva-tan-niyantṛtva-tad-vidhāra-katva-sarva-gatatvā-dy-asambhavaḥ jagad-vyāpāra-varjam aiśvaryaṃ. Ibid.* IV. 4. 20.

but indifferent entities and are neither pleasurable nor painful (*Vedānta-kaustubha-prabhā*, III. 2. 12). The relation of God and the world is like that of a snake and its coiled existence. The coiled (*kuṇḍala*) condition of a snake is neither different from it nor absolutely identical with it. So God's relation with the individuals also is like that of a lamp and its light (*prabhā-tadvator iva*) or like the sun and the illumination (*prakāśa*). God remains unchanged in Himself and only undergoes transformation through His energies as conscious (*cic-chakti*) and unconscious (*acic-chakti*)<sup>1</sup>. As the individuals cannot have any existence apart from Brahman, so the material world also cannot have any existence apart from him. It is in this sense that the material world is a part or constituent of God and is regarded as being one with God. But as the nature of the material world is different from the nature of God, it is regarded as different from Him<sup>2</sup>.

The Vedic duties of caste and stages of life are to be performed for the production of the desire of wisdom (*vividiṣā*), but once the true wisdom is produced there is no further need of the performance of the duties (*Ibid.* III. 4. 9). The wise man is never affected by the deeds that he performs. But though ordinarily the performance of the duties is helpful to the attainment of wisdom, this is not indispensable, and there are many who achieve wisdom without going through the customary path of caste duties and the duties attached to stages of life.

## Controversy with the Monists by Mādhava Mukunda.

### (a) *The Main Thesis and the Ultimate End in Advaita Vedānta are Untenable.*

Mādhava Mukunda, supposed to be a native of the village of Arunaghaṭī, Bengal, wrote a work called *Para-pakṣa-giri-vajra* or *Hārda-saṅcaya*, in which he tried to show from various points of

<sup>1</sup> *ananta-guṇa-lakṣmīmatō brahmaṇaḥ pariṇāmi-svabhāvā-cic-chakteḥ sthūlā-vasthūyām satyām tad-antarā-tmatvena tatprā-vasthāne'pi pariṇāmasya śakti-gatatvāt svarūpe pariṇāmā-bhāvāt kuṇḍala-dṛṣṭānto na doṣā-vahaḥ aprthak-siddhatvena abhede'pi bheda-jīlāpanā-rthaḥ. Vedānta-kaustubha-prabhā*, III. 2. 29.

<sup>2</sup> *jitvavat prthak-sthity-anarha-viśeṣanātvena acid-vastuno brahmā-mātvam viśiṣṭa-vastu-eka-dēśatvena abheda-vyavahāro mukhyaḥ viśeṣaṇa-viśeṣayoh svarūpa-svabhāva-bhedena ca bheda-vyavahāro mukhyaḥ. Ibid.* III. 2. 30.

view the futility of the monistic interpretation of Vedānta by Śaṅkara and his followers.

He says that the Śaṅkarites are interested in demonstrating the identity of the individuals with Brahman (*jīva-brahmai-kya*) and this forms the principal subject-matter of all their discussions. This identity may be illusory or not. In the former case duality or plurality would be real, and in the latter case, i.e. if identity be real, then the duality presupposed in the identification must also be real<sup>1</sup>. It is not the case of the single point of an identity that Śaṅkarites are interested in, but in the demonstration of an identification of the individuals with Brahman. The demonstration of identity necessarily implies the reality of the negation of the duality. If such a negation is false, the identification must also be false, for it is on the reality of the negation that the reality of the identification depends. If the negation of duality be real, then the duality must also be real in some sense and the identification can imply the reality of the negation only in some particular aspect.

The objections levelled by the Śaṅkarites against the admission of "duality" or "difference" as a category are, firstly, that the category of difference (*bheda*) being by nature a relation involves two poles and hence it cannot be identical in nature with its locus in which it is supposed to subsist (*bhedasya na adhikaraṇa-svarūpatvam*). Secondly, that if "difference" is different in nature from its locus, then a second grade of "difference" has to be introduced and this would imply another grade of difference and so on *ad infinitum*. Thus we have a vicious infinite. To the first objection, the reply is that "difference" is not relational in nature with this or that individual locus, but with the concept of the locus as such (*bhūtalatvā-dinā nirapekṣatve'pi adhikaraṇātmakatvena sāpekṣatve kṣaterabhāvāt*)<sup>2</sup>. The charge of vicious infinite by the introduction of differences of differences is invalid, for all differences are identical in nature with their locus. So in the case of a series of differences the nature of each difference becomes well defined and the viciousness of the infinite series vanishes. In the instance "there is a jug on the ground" the nature of the difference of the jug is jugness, whereas in the case of the difference of the difference, the second order of

<sup>1</sup> *dvitīye aikya-pratīyogika-bhedasya pāramārthikatva-prasaṅgāt. Para-pakṣa-giri-vajra*, p. 12.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 14.

difference has a separate specification as a special order of differenceness. Moreover, since difference reveals only the particular modes of the objects, these difficulties cannot arise. In perceiving difference we do not perceive difference as an entity different from the two objects between which it is supposed to subsist<sup>1</sup>. One might equally well find such a fault of mutual dependence on the identification of Brahman with *jīva*, since it depends upon the identification of the *jīva* with the Brahman.

A further discussion of the subject shows that there cannot be any objections against "differences" on the score of their being produced, for they merely subsist and are not produced; or on the possibility of their being known, for if differences were never perceived the Śāṅkarites would not have been so anxious to remove the so called illusions or mis-perception of differences, or to mispend their energies in trying to demonstrate that Brahman was different from all that was false, material and the like; and the saint also would not be able to distinguish between what was eternal and transitory. Again, it is held that there is a knowledge which contradicts the notion of difference. But if this knowledge itself involves difference it cannot contradict it. Whatever may signify anything must do so by restricting its signification to it, and all such restriction involves difference. Even the comprehension that demonstrates the illusoriness of "difference" (e.g. this is not difference, or there is no difference here, etc.) proves the existence of "difference." Moreover, a question may be raised as to whether the notion that contradicts difference is itself comprehended as different from difference or not. In the former case the validity of the notion leaves "difference" unmolested and in the second case, i.e. if it is not comprehended as different from "difference," it becomes identical with it and cannot contradict it.

If it is contended that in the above procedure an attempt has been made to establish the category of difference only in indirect manner and that nothing has been directly said in explanation of the concept of difference, the reply is that those who have sought to explain the concept of unity have fared no better. If it is urged that if ultimately the absolute unity or identity is not accepted then

<sup>1</sup> *nā'py anyonyā-śrayaḥ bheda-pratyakṣe pratiyogitā-vacchedaka-stambhatvādi-prakāra-ka-jñānasyai'va hetuvāt na tāvad bheda-pratyakṣe bheda-śrayād bhinnatvena pratiyogi-jñānaṃ hetuḥ. Para-pakṣa-giri-vajra, pp. 14, 15.*

that would lead us to nihilism, then it may also be urged with the same force that, differences being but modes of the objects themselves, a denial of difference would mean the denial of the objects, and this would also land us in nihilism. It must, however, be noted that though difference is but a mode of the objects which differ, yet the terms of reference by which difference becomes intelligible (the table is different from the chair: here the difference of the table is but its mode, though it becomes intelligible by its difference from the chair) are by no means constituents of the objects in which the difference exists as their mode. The Śāṅkarites believe in the refutation of dualism, as by such a refutation the unity is established. The thesis of unity is thus though, on the one hand dependent upon such refutation and yet on the other hand identical with it because all such refutations are believed to be imaginary. In the same manner it may be urged that the demonstration of difference involves with it a reference to other terms, but is yet identical in nature with the object of which it is a mode; the reference to the terms is necessary only for purposes of comprehension.

It must, however, be noted that since difference is but a mode of the object the comprehension of the latter necessarily means the comprehension of all differences existing in it. An object may be known in a particular manner, yet it may remain unknown in its differential aspects, just as the monists hold that pure consciousness is always flashing forth but yet its aspect as the unity of all things may remain unknown. In comprehending a difference between any two objects, no logical priority which could have led to a vicious circle is demanded. But the two are together taken in consciousness and the apprehension of the one is felt as its distinction from the other. The same sort of distinction has to be adduced by the monists also in explaining the comprehension of the identity of the individual souls with the Brahman, otherwise in their case too there would have been the charge of a vicious circle. For when one says "these two are not different," their duality and difference depend upon a comprehension of their difference which, while present, prevents their identity from being established. If it is held that the duality is imaginary whereas the identity is real, then the two being of a different order of existence the contradiction of the one cannot lead to the affirmation of the other. The apology that in comprehending identity no two-term reference is needed is futile, for an

identity is comprehended only as the negation of the two-term duality.

Thus, from the above considerations, the main thesis of the Śāṅkarites, that all things are identical with Brahman, falls to the ground.

According to Nimbārka the ideal of emancipation is participation in God's nature (*tad-bhāvā-patti*). This is the ultimate end and *summum bonum* of life (*prayojana*). According to the Śāṅkarites emancipation consists in the ultimate oneness or identity existing between individual souls and Brahman. The Brahman in reality is one with the individual souls, and the apparent difference noticed in our ordinary practical life is due to misconception and ignorance, which impose upon us a false notion of duality. Mādhava Mukunda urges that in such a view, since the individual souls are already one with Brahman, they have nothing to strive for. There is thus really no actual end (*proyojana*) as the goal of our strivings. Mādhava Mukunda, in attempting to emphasize the futility of the Śāṅkarite position, says that, if the ultimate consciousness be regarded as one, then it would be speckled with the various experiences of individuals. It cannot be held to be appearing as different in accordance with the variety of conditions through which it appears, for in our experiences we find that though through our various cognitive organs we have various experiences they are also emphasized as belonging to one being. Variability of conditions does not necessarily imply a variety of the units of experience of individual beings, as is maintained by the Śāṅkarites. The pure and ubiquitous differenceless consciousness (*nirviśeṣa-caitanya*) cannot also be regarded as capable of being identified as one with the plurality of minds (*antaḥkarana*). Again, it is admitted by the Śāṅkarites that in dreamless sleep the mind is dissolved. If that were so and if pure consciousness is regarded as being capable of manifesting itself through false identification with minds, there would be no explanation of the continuity of consciousness from day to day in the form of memory. It cannot be urged that such a continuity is maintained by the fact that minds exist in a state of potency (*saṃskārā-tmanā' vasthitasya*) in the deep dreamless sleep; for the mind in a potent state cannot be regarded as carrying impressions and memories, since in that case there would be memories even in dreamless sleep.

Further, if the experiences are supposed to belong to the states of ignorance, then emancipation, which refers only to pure consciousness, would refer to an entity different from that which was suffering from bondage. On the other hand, if the experiences belong to pure consciousness, then emancipation will be associated with diverse contradictory experiences at the same time according to the diversity of experiences.

The Śāṅkarites may urge that the conditions which bring about the experiences are associated with pure consciousness and hence in an indirect manner there is a continuity of the being that experiences and attains salvation. To this the reply is that the experiencing of sorrow is a sufficient description of the conditions. That being so, where the experiencing of sorrow does not exist, the conditions, of which it is a sufficient description, also do not exist. Thus, the discontinuity of the entities which suffer bondage and attain emancipation remains the same.

Again, since it is held that the conditions subsist in the pure consciousness, it may well be asked whether emancipation means the dissolution of one condition or many conditions. In the former case we should have emancipation always, for one or other of the conditions is being dissolved every moment, and in the latter case we might not have any emancipation at all, for all the conditions determining the experiences of infinite individuals can never be dissolved.

It may also be asked whether the conditions are associated with the pure consciousness in part or in whole. In the first alternative there would be a vicious infinite and in the second the differentiation of the pure consciousness in various units would be inadmissible.

Moreover, it may be asked whether conditions are associated with pure consciousness conditionally or unconditionally. In the former alternative there would be a vicious infinite and in the second case there would be no chance of emancipation. The theory of reflection cannot also explain the situation, for reflection is admitted only when the reflected image has the same order of existence as the object. The *avidyā* has a different order of existence from Brahman, and thus reflection of Brahman in *avidyā* cannot be justified. Again, in reflection that which is reflected and that in which the reflection takes place must be in two different places,

whereas in the case of *avidyā* and Brahman the former is supposed to have Brahman as its support. The conditions (*upādhi*) cannot occupy a part of Brahman, for Brahman has no parts; nor can they occupy the whole of it, for in that case there will be no reflection.

In the Nimbārka system both the monistic and the dualistic texts have their full scope, the dualistic texts in demonstrating the difference that exists between souls and God, and the monistic texts showing the final goal in which the individuals realize themselves as constituents of Him and as such one with Him. But in the Śāṅkara system, where no duality is admitted, everything is self-realized, there is nothing to be attained and even the process of instruction of the disciple by the preceptor is unavailable, as they are all but adumbrations of ignorance.

(b) *Refutation of the Śāṅkara Theory of  
Illusion in its various Aspects.*

The Śāṅkarite doctrine of illusion involves a supposition that the basis of illusion (*adhiṣṭhāna*) is imperfectly or partly known. The illusion consists in the imposition of certain appearances upon the unknown part. The stump of a tree is perceived in part as an elongated thing but not in the other part as the stump of a tree, and it is in reference to this part that the mis-attribution of an illusory appearance, e.g. a man, is possible by virtue of which the elongated part is perceived as man. But Brahman is partless and no division of its part is conceivable. It must therefore be wholly known or wholly unknown, and hence there can be no illusion regarding it. Again, illusion implies that an illusory appearance has to be imposed upon an object. But the *avidyā*, which is beginningless, cannot itself be supposed to be an illusory appearance. Following the analogy of beginninglessness Brahman may be regarded as illusory. The reply that Brahman being the basis cannot be illusory is meaningless; for though the basis is regarded as the ground of the imposition, there is no necessary implication that the basis must also be true. The objection that the basis has an independent reality because it is the basis associated with ignorance which can become the datum of illusion is futile; because the basis may also be an unreal one in a serial process where at each stage it is associated with ignorance. In such a view it is not the pure Brahman which becomes the basis but the illusory Brahman which is associated with

ignorance. Moreover, if the *avidyā* and its modifications were absolutely non-existent they could not be the subject of imposition. What really exists somewhere may be imposed elsewhere, but not that which does not exist at all. The pure chimericals like the hare's horn can never be the subjects of imposition, for that which is absolutely non-existent cannot appear at all.

Again, illusions are supposed to happen through the operation of impressions (*samskāra*), but in the beginningless cosmic illusion the impressions must also be beginningless and co-existent with the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) and therefore real. The impressions must exist prior to the illusion and as such they cannot themselves be illusory, and if they are not illusory they must be real. Again, the impressions cannot belong to Brahman, for then it could not be qualityless and pure; they cannot belong to individual souls, for these are produced as a result of illusory impositions which are again the products of the operation of impressions. Further, similarity plays an important part in all illusions, but Brahman as the ground or basis which is absolutely pure and qualityless has no similarity with anything. There cannot also be any imaginary similarity imposed upon the qualityless Brahman, for such an imaginary imposition presupposes a prior illusion. Again, all illusions are seen to have a beginning, whereas entities that are not illusory, such as the individual souls, are found to be beginningless. It is also erroneous to hold that the ego-substratum behaves as the basis of the illusion, for it is itself a product of the illusion.

Furthermore, the supposition that the world-appearance is a cosmic illusion which is related to pure consciousness in an illusory relation (*ādhyāsika-sambandha*) is unwarrantable. But the Śāṅkarites admit that the relation between the external world and the knower is brought about by the operation of the mind in modification, called *vṛtti*. Moreover, if the pure consciousness be admitted to be right knowledge or *pramā*, then its object or that which shines with it must also be right knowledge and as such it cannot be the basis of false knowledge. If the pure consciousness be false knowledge, it cannot obviously be the basis of false knowledge. The mere fact that some of the known relations, such as contact, inseparable inherence, do not hold between the object of knowledge and knowledge does not prove that their relation must be an illusory one, for other kinds of relations may subsist between them Knowledge-and-

the-known may itself be regarded as a unique kind of relation. It is also wrong to suppose that all relations are false because they are constituents of the false universe, for the universe is supposed to be false because the relations are false, and hence there would be a vicious infinite. Again, the objection that, if relations are admitted to establish connection between two relata, then further relations may be necessary to relate the relation to relata and that this would lead to a vicious infinite, and also that, if relations are identical in essence with the relata, then relations become useless, is futile. The same objections would be admissible in the case of illusory relations. If it is held that, since all relations are illusory, the above strictures do not apply, then it may be pointed out that if the order of the relations be subversed, then, instead of conceiving the jug to be a product of *māyā*, *māyā* may be taken as a product of the jug. Thus, not only the Śāṅkarites but even the Buddhists have to admit the orderly character of relations. In the Nimbārka view all relations are regarded as true, being the different modes of the manifestation of the energy of God. Even if the relations be denied, then the nature of Brahman cannot be described as this or that.

(c) *Refutation of the Śāṅkarite View of Ajñāna.*

*Ajñāna* is defined as a beginningless positive entity which is destructible by knowledge (*anādi-bhāvatve sati jñāna-nivartyatvam*). The definition is unavailing as it does not apply to ignorance that hides an ordinary object before it is perceived. Nor does *ajñāna* apply to the ignorance regarding the negation of an object, since it is of a positive nature. Again, in the case of the ignorance that abides in the saint who has attained the knowledge of Brahman, the *ajñāna* is seen to persist even though knowledge has been attained; hence the definition of *ajñāna* as that which is destructible by knowledge fails. In the case of the perception of red colour in the crystal through reflection, the ignorant perception of the white crystal as red persists even though it is known to be false and due to reflection. Here also the ignorance is not removed by knowledge. It is also wrong to suppose that *ajñāna*, which is but the product of defect, should be regarded as beginningless. Moreover, it may be pointed out that all things (excluding negation) that are beginningless are also eternal like the souls and it is a curious assumption that

there should be an entity called *ajñāna* which is beginningless and yet destructible. Again, *ajñāna* is often described as being different both from being and non-being, but has yet been defined as a positive entity. It is also difficult to imagine how, since negative entities are regarded as products of *ajñāna*, *ajñāna* may itself be regarded as a positive entity. Moreover, the error or illusion that takes place through absence of knowledge has to be admitted as a negative entity; but being an illusion it has to be regarded as a product of *ajñāna*.

There is no proof of the existence of *ajñāna* in the so-called perception "I am ignorant." It cannot be the pure Brahman, for then that would have to be styled impure. It cannot be a positive knowledge by itself, for that is the very point which has to be proved. Further, if in establishing *ajñāna* (ignorance) one has to fall back upon *jñāna* or knowledge, and if in establishing the latter one has to fall back upon the former, then that would involve a vicious circle. It cannot be the ego-substratum (*aham-artha*), for that is itself a product of *ajñāna* and cannot be in existence as the datum of the perception of *ajñāna*. The ego itself cannot be perceived as ignorant, for it is itself a product of ignorance. The ego is never regarded as synonymous with ignorance, and thus there is no means of proving the supposition that ignorance is perceived as a positive entity either as a quality or as a substance. Ignorance is thus nothing but "absence of knowledge" (*jñānā-bhāva*) and ought to be recognized by the Śāṅkarites, since they have to admit the validity of the experience "I do not know what you say" which is evidently nothing but a reference to the absence of knowledge which is admitted by the Śāṅkarites in other cases. There is no proof that the cases in point are in any way different from such cases of absence of knowledge. Again, if the *ajñāna* is regarded as hiding an object, then in the case of mediate knowledge (*parokṣa-vṛtti*)—where according to the Śāṅkarites the *vṛtti* or the mental state does not remove the veil of *ajñāna*) one ought to feel that one is ignorant of the object of one's mediate knowledge, for the veil of *ajñāna* remains here intact<sup>1</sup>. Moreover, all cases of the supposed perception of ignorance can be explained as the comprehension of the absence of knowledge. In the above manner Mukunda criti-

<sup>1</sup> *parokṣa-vṛter viśayā-varukā-jñāna-nivartakatvena parokṣato jñāte'pi na jñānām'ity anubhavā-pātāt ca. Para-pakṣa-giri-vajra*, p. 76.

cizes the theories of *ajñāna* and of the illusion in their various aspects. But as the method of the dialectic followed in these logical refutations is substantially the same as that attempted by Venkṛṣṇānātha and Vyāsatīrtha which have been examined in detail it is not necessary to give a detailed study of Mukunda's treatment.

### The Pramāṇas according to Mādhava Mukunda.

The followers of Nimbārka admit only three (perception, inference and testimony) out of the following eight *pramāṇas*, viz. perception (*pratyakṣa*), inference (*anumāna*), similarity (*upamāna*), scriptural testimony (*śabda*), implication (*arthāpatti*), non-perception (*anupalabdhi*), inclusion of the lower within the higher as of ten within a hundred (*sambhava*), and tradition (*aitihya*). Perception is of two kinds, external and internal. The external perception is of five kinds according to the five cognitive senses. The mental perception called also the internal perception is of two kinds, ordinary (*laukika*) and transcendent (*alaukika*). The perception of pleasure and pain is a case of ordinary internal perception, whereas the perception of the nature of self, God and their qualities is a case of transcendent internal perception. This transcendent internal perception is again of two kinds, that which flashes forth through the meditation of an entity and that which comes out of meditation on the essence of a scriptural text. The scriptural reference that the ultimate truth cannot be perceived by the mind means either that the ultimate truth in its entirety cannot be perceived by the mind or that unless the mind is duly trained by a teacher or by the formation of right tendencies it cannot have a glimpse of the transcendent realities. Knowledge is a beginningless, eternal and all-pervasive characteristic of individual selves. But in our state of bondage this knowledge is like the rays of a lamp in a closed place, in a state of contraction. Just as the rays of a lamp enclosed within a jug may go out through the hole into the room and straight through the door of the room and flood with light some object outside, so the knowledge in each individual may by the modification of the mind reach the senses and again through their modification reach the object and, having flood-lit it, may illuminate both the object and the knowledge. The *ajñāna* (ignorance) that ceases with the knowledge of an object is the partial cessation of a state of contraction

leading to the flashing of knowledge. What is meant by the phrase "knowledge has an object" is that knowledge takes a particular form and illuminates it. The objects remain as they are, but they are manifested through their association with knowledge and remain unmanifested without it. In the case of internal perception the operation of the senses is not required, and so pleasure and pain are directly perceived by the mind. In self-consciousness or the perception of the self, the self being itself self-luminous, the mental directions to the self remove the state of contraction and reveal the nature of the self. So God can be realized through His grace and the removal of obstruction through the meditative condition of the mind<sup>1</sup>.

In inference the knowledge of the existence of the *hetu* (reason) in the minor (*pakṣa*) having a concomitance (*vyāpti*) with the probandum (*sādhya*), otherwise called *parāmarśa* (*vahni-vyāpya-dhūmavān ayam evaṃ-rūpaḥ*), is regarded as the inferential process (*anumāna*) and from it comes the inference (e.g. "the hill is fiery"). Two kinds of inference, i.e. for the conviction of one's own self (*svārthānumāna*) and for convincing others (*parārthānumāna*), are admitted here; and in the latter case only three propositions (the thesis, *pratijñā*, the reason, *hetu*, and the instance, *udāharana*) are regarded as necessary. Three kinds of inference are admitted, namely *kevalā-nvayi* (argument from only positive instances, where negative instances are not available), *kevala-vyatireki* (argument from purely negative instances, where positive instances are not available), and *anvaya-vyatireki* (argument from both sets of positive and negative instances). In addition to the well-known concomitance (*vyāpti*) arising from the above three ways, scriptural assertions are also regarded as cases of concomitance. Thus there is a scriptural passage to the following effect: The self is indestructible and it is never divested of its essential qualities (*avināśī vā are ātma an-ucchitti-dharmā*), and this is regarded as a *vyāpti* or concomitance, from which one may infer the indestructibility of the soul like the Brahman.<sup>2</sup> There are no other specially interesting features in the Nimbārka doctrine of inference.

Knowledge of similarity is regarded as being due to a separate *pramāṇa* called *upamāna*. Such a comprehension of similarity (*sādrśya*) may be due to perception or through a scriptural assertion

<sup>1</sup> *Para-pakṣa-giri-vajra*, pp. 203-206.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 210.

of similarity. Thus a man may perceive the similarity of the face to the moon or he may learn from the scriptures that the self and God are similar in nature and thus comprehend such similarity. This may be included within the proposition of instance or illustration in an inference (*upamānasya dṛṣṭānta-mātrā-ika-vigraha-tvenā'numānā-vayave udāharaṇe antarbhāvaḥ*. *Para-pakṣa-giri-vajra*, p. 254).

That from which there is a communication of the negation or non-existence of anything is regarded as the *pramāṇa* or *anupalabdhi*. It is of four kinds: firstly, the negation that precedes a production, called *prāg-abhāva*; secondly, the negation of one entity in another, i.e. the negation as "otherness," called *anyonyā-bhāva*; thirdly, the negation as the destruction of an entity, called *dhvaṃsā-bhāva*; fourthly, the negation of an entity in all times (*kālatraye'pi nastī'ti pratīti-viśayaḥ atyantā-bhāvaḥ*). But it is unnecessary to admit *abhāva* or *anupalabdhi* as a separate *pramāṇa*, for according to the Nimbārka negation is not admitted as a separate category. The perception of negation is nothing but the perception of the locus of the object of negation as unassociated with it. The negation-precedent (*prāg-abhāva*) of a jug is nothing but the lump of clay; the negation of destruction of a jug is nothing but the broken fragments of a jug; the negation of otherness (*anyonyā-bhāva*) is the entity that is perceived as the other of another, and the negation existent in all times is nothing but the locus of a negation. Thus the *pramāṇa* of negation may best be included with perception. The *pramāṇa* of implication may well be taken as a species of inference. The *pramāṇa* of *sambhava* may well be regarded as a deductive piece of reasoning.

The Nimbārka admit the self-validity of the *pramāṇas* (*svataḥ-prāmāṇya*) in the manner of the Śāṅkarites. Self-validity (*svatastva*) is defined as the fact that in the absence of any defect an assemblage forming the data of cognition produces a cognition that represents its nature as it is (*doṣā-bhāvatve yāvat-svā-śraya-bhūta-pramā-grāhaka-sāmagrī-mātra-grāhyatvam*)<sup>1</sup>. Just as the eye when it perceives a coloured object perceives also the colours and forms associated with it, so it takes with the cognition of an object also the validity of such a cognition.

The nature of God can, however, be expressed only by the

<sup>1</sup> *Para-pakṣa-giri-vajra*, p. 253.

scriptural texts, as the signifying powers of these texts directly originate from God. Indeed, all the powers of individual minds also are derived from God, but they cannot signify Him as they are tainted by the imperfections of the human mind. The Mīmāṃsists are wrong to think that the import of all parts of the Vedas consists in enjoining the performance of the Vedic duties, for the results of all deeds ultimately produce a desire for knowing Brahman and through it produce the fitness for the attainment of emancipation. Thus considered from this point of view the goal of the performance of all duties is the attainment of emancipation<sup>1</sup>. There cannot be any scope for the performance of duties for one who has realized the Brahman, for that is the ultimate fruit of all actions and the wise man has nothing else to attain by the performance of actions. Just as though different kinds of seeds may be sown, yet if there is no rain these different kinds of seeds cannot produce the different kinds of trees, so the actions by themselves cannot produce the fruits independently. It is through God's grace that actions can produce their specific fruits. So though the obligatory duties are helpful in purifying the mind and in producing a desire for true knowledge, they cannot by themselves be regarded as the ultimate end, which consists in the production of a desire for true knowledge and the ultimate union with God.

### Criticism of the views of Rāmānuja and Bhāskara.

The view of Rāmānuja and his followers is that the souls and the inanimate world are associated with God as His qualities. The function of qualities (*viśeṣana*) is that by their presence they distinguish an object from other similar objects. Thus, when one says "Rāma the son of Daśaratha," the adjective "son of Daśaratha" distinguishes this Rāma from the other two Rāmas, Balarāma and Paraśurāma. But no such purpose is served by styling the individual souls and the inanimate nature as being qualities of Brahman, for they do not distinguish Him from any other similar persons; for the Rāmānujists also do not admit any other category than the conscious souls, the unconscious world and God the controller of them both. Since there is nothing to differentiate, the concept of the souls and matter as quality or differentia also fails. Another

<sup>1</sup> *Para-pakṣa-giri-vajra*, pp. 279-280.

function of qualities is that they help the substance to which they belong to become better known. The knowledge of souls and matter as qualities of God does not help us to know or comprehend Him better.

Again, if God be associated with matter and souls, He is found to be associated with their defects also. It may be argued whether the Brahman in which the souls and matter are held to abide is itself unqualified or qualified. In the former alternative the Rāmānujas like the Śāṅkarites have to admit the existence of an unqualified entity and a part in Brahman has to be admitted which exists in itself as an unqualified entity. If the Brahman be in part qualityless and in part associated with qualities, then it would in part be omniscient only in certain parts of itself. Again, if the pure unassociated Brahman be regarded as omniscient, then there would be one Brahman associated with omniscience and other qualities and another Brahman associated with matter and soul, and the doctrine of qualified monism would thus break down. The pure Brahman being outside the souls and matter, these two would be without a controller inside them and would thus be independent of God. Moreover, God in this view would be in certain parts associated with the highest and purest qualities and in other parts with the defiled characters of the material world and the imperfect souls. In the other alternative, i.e. if Brahman as associated with matter and souls be the ultimate substance which is qualified with matter and souls, then there would be two composite entities and not one, and God will as before be associated with two opposite sets of pure and impure qualities. Again, if God be admitted to be a composite unity and if matter and souls which are regarded as mutually distinct and different are admitted to be constituents of Him though He is different in nature from them, it is difficult to imagine how under the circumstances those constituents can be at once one with God and yet different from Him<sup>1</sup>.

In the Nimbārka view Śrī Kṛṣṇa is the Lord, the ultimate Brahman and He is the support of the universe consisting of the souls and matter which are derivative parts of Him and are absolutely under His control and thus have a dependent existence only (*para-tantra-sattva*). Entities that have dependent existence are of two kinds, the souls which, though they pass through apparent

<sup>1</sup> *Para-pakṣa-giri-vajra*, p. 342.

birth and death, are yet eternal in their nature and the substance of the corporeal structure that supports them, the matter. The scriptural texts that speak of duality refer to this duality that subsists between the ultimate substance, the Brahman, which alone has the independent existence, and souls and matter which have only a dependent existence. The scriptural texts that deny duality refer to the ultimate entity which has independent existence which forms the common ground and basis of all kinds of existence. The texts that try to refer to Brahman by negations (*ne'ti, ne'ti*) signify how Brahman is different from all other things, or, in other words, how Brahman is different from matter and the souls which are limited by material conditions<sup>1</sup>. Brahman is thus the absolute Being, the abode of all good and noble qualities, which is different from all entities having only dependent existence. The monistic texts refer to the fact, as has already been noted, that the world of matter and the infinite number of souls having but dependent existence cannot exist independent of God (*tad-aprthak-siddha*) and are, in that sense, one with Him. They also have the essence of their being in Brahman (*brahmā-tmatva*), are pervaded through and through by it (*tad-vyāpyatva*), are supported in it and held in it and are always being completely controlled and dominated by it<sup>2</sup>. Just as all individual objects, a jug, a stone, etc., may be said to have substantiality (*dravyatva*) permeating through them by virtue of their being substances, so the souls and the matter may be called God by virtue of the fact that God permeates through them as their inner essence. But just as none of these individual objects can be regarded as substance *per se*, so the souls and matter cannot also be identified with God as being one with Him<sup>3</sup>.

The Bhāskarites are wrong in asserting that the individuals are false inasmuch as they have only a false appearance through the

<sup>1</sup> *vastutas tu ne'ti ne'ti'ti nañbhyāṃ prakṛta-sthūla-sūkṣmatvām-di-dharmavat jada-vastu-tad-avacchinna-jīva-vas'u-vilakṣaṇaṃ brahme'ti prutipādyate. Para-pakṣa-giri-vajra, p. 347.*

<sup>2</sup> *tayōś ca brahmā-tmakatva-tan-niyamyatva-tad-vyāpyatva-tad-adhīna-sattva-tad-ādhyatva-di-yogena tad-aprthak-siddhatvāt abhedo'pi svābhāvikaḥ. Ibid. p. 355.*

<sup>3</sup> *yathā ghaṭo dravyaṃ, prthivī-dravyam ity-ādau dravyatvā-vacchinnena saha ghaṭatvā-vacchinna-prthivītvā-vacchinnayoḥ sāmānādhikarāṇyaṃ mukhyaṃ eva viśeṣasya sāmānyā-bhinna-tva-niyamāt evaṃ prakṛte'pi sāvajñyā-dy-anantā-chintyā-parimita-viśeṣā-vacchinnenā'paricchinna-śakti-vibhūtikena tat-padārthena para-bhrahmaṇā svā-tmaka-cetana-cetanatvā-vacchinyayos tad-ātma-rūpayos tvam-ādi-padārthayoḥ sāmānādhikarāṇyaṃ mukhyaṃ eva. Ibid. pp. 355-356.*

limitations (*upādhi*) imposed upon the pure Brahman. The nature of the imposition of Brahman by the so-called conditions is unintelligible. It may mean that the atomic individual is the result of the imposition of the conditions on Brahman by which the Brahman as a whole appears as the individual soul or by which the Brahman is split asunder, and being thus split appears as the individual self or the Brahman as qualified by the conditions or that the conditions themselves appear as the individuals. The Brahman being homogeneous and unchangeable cannot be split asunder. Even if it can be split asunder, the individual selves being the products of such a splitting would have a beginning in time and would not thus be eternal; and it has to be admitted that on such a view Brahman has to be split up into as many infinite parts as there are selves. If it is held that the parts of Brahman as limited by the conditions appear as individual souls, then Brahman would be subject to all the defects of the conditions which could so modify it as to resolve it into parts for the production of the individual selves. Moreover, owing to the shifting nature of the conditions the nature of the selves would vary and they might have in this way spontaneous bondage and salvation<sup>1</sup>. If with the shifting of the conditions Brahman also shifts, then Brahman would not be partless and all-pervasive. If it is held that Brahman in its entirety becomes envisaged by the conditions, then, on the one hand, there will be no transcendent pure Brahman and, on the other, there will be one self in all the different bodies. Again, if the individuals are regarded as entirely different from Brahman, then the assertion that they are but the product of the conditioning of Brahman has to be given up. If it is held that the conditions themselves are the individuals, then it becomes a materialistic view like that of the Cārvākas. Again, it cannot be held that the conditions only cover up the natural qualities of Brahman such as omniscience, etc., for these being natural qualities of Brahman cannot be removed. Further questions may arise as to whether these natural qualities of Brahman are different from Brahman or not, or whether this is a case of difference-in-identity. They cannot be absolutely different, for that would be an admission of duality. They cannot be identical with Brahman, for then they

<sup>1</sup> *kiñ ca upādhaiḥ gacchati sati upādhiṇā svā-vacchinna-brahma-pradeśa-karṣaṇa-yogāt anukṣaṇam upādhi-samyukta-pradeśa-bhedāt kṣaṇe kṣaṇe bandha-mokṣau syātām. Para-pakṣa-giri-vajra, p. 357.*

could not be regarded as qualities of Brahman. If it be its own essence, then it cannot be covered up, for in that case Brahman would lose all its omniscience. If it is held that it is a case of difference-in-identity, then it comes to an acceptance of the Nimbārka creed.

Again, if it is held that the so-called natural qualities of omniscience, etc., are also due to conditions, it may be asked whether such conditions are different from or identical with Brahman. In the latter alternative they would have no capacity to produce any plurality in Brahman. In the former alternative, it may be asked whether they are moved by themselves into operation or by some other entity or by Brahman. The first view would be open to the criticism of self-dynamism, the second to that of a vicious infinite, and the third to a vicious circle. Moreover, in this view, Brahman being eternal, its dynamism would also be eternal; at no time would the conditions cease to operate, and thus there would be no emancipation. The conditions cannot be regarded as false, unreal or non-existent, for then that would be an acceptance of the Nimbārka creed<sup>1</sup>.

It may further be asked whether the conditions are imposed by certain causes or whether they are without any cause. In the former alternative we have a vicious infinite and in the latter even emancipated beings may have further bondage. Again, it may be asked whether the qualities, e.g. omniscience, that belong to Brahman pervade the whole of Brahman or whether they belong only to particular parts of Brahman. In the former view, if there is entire veiling of the qualities of Brahman there cannot be any emancipation and the whole field of consciousness being veiled by ignorance there is absolute blindness or darkness (*jagad-āndhya-prasaṅga*). In the second view the omniscience of Brahman being only a quality or a part of it the importance of Brahman as a whole fails.

Following the Bhāskara line it may be asked whether the emancipated beings have separate existence or not. If the former alternative be admitted, and if after destruction of the conditions the individuals still retain their separate existence then the view that differences are created by the conditions has to be given up (*aupādhika-bheda-vādo datta-jalāṅjaliḥ syāt*). If the distinctness of the souls is not preserved in their emancipation, then their very

<sup>1</sup> *Para-pakṣa-giri-vajra*, p. 358.

essence is destroyed, and this would almost be the same as the *māyā* doctrine of the Śāṅkarites, who hold that the essential nature of both God and souls is destructible.

It is wrong to suppose that individuals are but parts of which a structural Brahman is constituted, for in that case, being made up of parts, the Brahman would be itself destructible. When the scriptures speak of the universe and the souls as being but a part of Brahman, the main emphasis is on the fact that Brahman is infinite and the universe is but too small in comparison with it. It is also difficult to imagine how the minds or the *antaḥkaraṇas* can operate as conditions for limiting the nature of the Brahman. How should Brahman allow these so-called conditions to mutilate its nature? It could not have created these conditions for the production of individual souls, for these souls were not in existence before the conditions were in existence. Thus the Bhāskara doctrine that the concept of distinction and unity of Brahman is due to the operation of conditions (*aupādhika-bhedābheda-vāda*) is entirely false.

According to the Nimbārka view, therefore, the unity and difference that exist between the individuals and Brahman is natural (*svābhāvika*) and not due to conditions (*aupādhika*) as in the case of Bhāskara. The coiling posture (*kuṇḍala*) of a snake is different from the long snake as it is in itself and is yet identical with it in the sense that the coiling posture is an effect; it is dependent and under the absolute control of the snake as it is and it has no separate existence from the nature of the snake as it is. The coiled state of the snake exists in the elongated state but only in an undifferentiated, unperceivable way; and is nothing but the snake by which it is pervaded through and through and supported in its entirety. So this universe of matter and souls is also in one aspect absolutely identical with God, being supported entirely by Him, pervaded through and through by Him and entirely dependent on Him, and yet in another aspect different from Him in all its visible manifestations and operations<sup>1</sup>. The other analogy through which the Nimbārkaists try to explain the situation is that of the sun and its rays which are at once one with it and are also perceived as different from it.

<sup>1</sup> *yathā kuṇḍalā-vasthā-pannasya aheḥ kuṇḍalam vyaktā-pannatvāt pratyakṣa-pramāṇa-gocaram tad-bhedasya svābhāvikatvāt lambāyamānā-vasthāyām tu sarpa-yatā-vacchinna-svarūpeṇa kuṇḍalasya tatra sattve'pi avyakta-nāma-rūpatā-pattiyā pratyakṣa-gocaratvam sarvā-tmakatva-tad-ādheyatva-tad-vyāpyatvā-dinā tad-aprithak-siddhatvād abhedasyā'pi svābhāvikatvam. Para-pakṣa-giri-vajra, p. 361.*

The difference of this view from that of the Rāmānujists is that while the latter consider that the souls and the matter qualify the nature of Brahman and are in that sense one with it, the former repudiate the concept of a permanent modification of the nature of Brahman by the souls and matter.

### The Reality of the World.

The Śāṅkarites hold that if the world which is of the nature of effect were real it would not be liable to contradiction at the time of Brahma-knowledge; if it were chimerical it would not appear to our sense. The world, however, appears to our senses and is ultimately liable to contradiction; it has therefore an indefinable (*anirvacanīya*) nature which is the same thing as saying that the world is false<sup>1</sup>. But what is the meaning of this indefinability? It cannot mean the absolutely non-existent, like the chimerical entities of the hare's horn; it cannot mean that which is absolutely non-existent, for then it would be the souls. But all things must be either existent or non-existent, for there is no third category which is different from the existent and the non-existent. It cannot also be that of which no definition can be given, for it has already been defined as indefinability (*nā'pi nirvacanā-narhattvam anenai'va nirucyamānatayā asambhavāt*). It cannot be said to be that which is not the locus of non-existence, for even the chimericals are not so, and even Brahman, which is regarded as existent and which is absolutely qualityless, is not the locus of any real existence; for Brahman is only existent in its own nature and is not the locus of any other existence. If it is said that Brahman is the locus of the existence of false appearances, then that may be said to be true as well of the so-called indefinable. Brahman is not the locus of any existence that has the same status as itself. It cannot be defined as that which is not the locus of either the existent or the non-existent, for there is nothing which is the locus of absolute non-existence, since even the chimerical is not the locus of its own non-existence. Moreover, since Brahman and the chimerical have the quality of being qualityless, they may themselves be regarded as the locus of that which is both existent and

<sup>1</sup> *asac cen na prativate sac cen na vādhyate, prativate vādhyate ca atah sad-asad-vilakṣaṇam hy anirvacanīyam eva abhyūpagantavyam. Para-pakṣa-giri-vajra, p. 384.*

non-existent, and as such may themselves be regarded as indefinable.

It cannot also be said that indefinability is that of which no sufficient description can be given that "this is such" or that "this is not such," for no such sufficient description can be given of Brahman itself. There would thus be little difference between Brahman and the indefinable. If it is held that "the indefinable" is that regarding the existence of which no evidence can be put forward, then the same may be said about Brahman, because the Brahman being the conceptless pure essence, it is not possible to prove its existence by any proof.

Again, when it is said that the indefinable is that which is neither existent nor non-existent, the meaning of the two terms "existence" and "non-existence" becomes somewhat unintelligible. For "existence" cannot mean only "being" as a class concept, for such a concept does not exist either in Brahman or in the world-appearance. Existence cannot be defined as causal efficiency (*artha-kriyā-kāritva*), nor as that which is never contradicted; nor non-existence as that which is contradicted, for the world-appearance which is liable to contradiction is not supposed to be non-existent; it is said to be that which is neither existent nor non-existent. Existence and non-existence cannot also be defined as that which can or cannot be proved, for Brahman is an entity which is neither proved nor unproved. Moreover, the world-appearance cannot be said to be that which is different from all that which can be called "existent" or "non-existent," for it is admitted to have a practical existence (*vyavahārika-sattā*). Again, it cannot be urged that if the nature of anything cannot be properly defined as existent or non-existent that it signifies that such an entity must be wholly unreal (*avāstava*). If a thing is not properly describable as existent or non-existent, that does not imply that it is unreal. The nature of the final dissolution of *avidyā* cannot be described as existent or not, but that does not imply that such a dissolution is itself unreal and indefinable (*nā'nirvācyaśca tat-kṣayaḥ*).

Again, from the simple assertion that the world is liable to dissolution through knowledge, its falsity does not necessarily follow. It is wrong to suppose that knowledge destroys only false ignorance, for knowledge destroys its own negation which has a content similar to that of itself; the knowledge of one thing, say

that of a jug, is removed by the knowledge of another, the sub-conscious impression is removed by recognition, attachment is removed by the knowledge of the defects of all worldly things and so also virtuous actions destroy sins. In the case under discussion also it may well be supposed that it is not merely the knowledge of Brahman but meditation of its nature that removes all false notions about the world. Thus, even if the bondage is real, there cannot be any objection that it cannot be cut asunder through the meditation of the nature of Brahman if the scriptures so direct. It does not follow from any legitimate assumption that what can be cut asunder or removed must necessarily be false. Again, it is well known in experience that what demolishes and what is demolished have the same status of existence; if the knowledge of Brahman can destroy our outlook of the world, that outlook must also be a real and true one. As the knowledge and the object of knowledge have the same status, the defects, as also the locus wherein the defects are imposed, have the same status; the Brahman and the *ajñāna* also have the same status and both are equally real.

Further, if what is called *ajñāna* is merely false knowledge, then even when it is removed by the realization, there is no reason why it should still persist in the stage of *jīvanmukti* or sainthood. The mere fact, therefore, that anything is removable by knowledge does not prove its falsity but only its antagonism to knowledge. So the world is real and the bondage also is real. The bondage is removed not by any kind of knowledge but by the grace of God<sup>1</sup>. The function of true knowledge is to awaken God to exert His grace to cut asunder the knots of bondage.

Again, all the scriptures agree in holding that the world we see around us is being protected and maintained by God. If the world were but a mere false appearance, there would be no meaning in saying that it is being maintained by God. For knowing the world-appearance to be false, He would not be tempted to make any effort for the protection and maintenance of that which is false and unreal. If God Himself is admitted to be under the influence of ignorance, He cannot be entitled to be called God at all.

Pursuing the old dialectical type of reasoning, Mādhava Mukunda urges that the sort of falsehood that is asserted of the

<sup>1</sup> *vastutas tu bhagavat-prasādād eva bandha-nivṛttir na prakāra'ntareṇa. Para-pakṣa-giri-vāṇī, p. 388.*

world can never be proved or demonstrated. One of the reasons that is adduced in favour of the falsity of the world is that it is knowable or the object of an intellectual state (*dṛśya*). But if the Vedāntic texts refer to the nature of Brahman, the due comprehension and realization of the meaning of such texts must involve the concept of the nature of Brahman as its object, and thus Brahman itself would be the object of an intellectual state and therefore false. If it is urged that the Brahman can be the object of an intellectual state only in a conditioned form and that the conditioned Brahman is admitted to be false, then the reply is that since the Brahman in its pure form can never manifest itself its purity cannot be proved. If the Brahman does not express itself in its purity through an ideational state corresponding to scriptural texts describing the nature of Brahman, then it is not self-luminous; if it is expressed through such a state, then being expressible through a mental state it is false. It cannot also be said that since all that is impure is known to be non-self-luminous it follows that all that is pure is self-luminous, for the pure being absolutely unrelatined cannot be referred to or known by way of a negative concomitance. Thus the impure is known only in itself as a positive entity and not as the opposite of the pure, for such a knowledge would imply the knowledge of purity. If, therefore, the predicate of self-luminosity is not denied of impurity as an opposite of "purity," the predicate of self-luminosity cannot also be affirmed of "purity." Moreover, if the pure Brahman is never intelligibly realizable, then there would be no emancipation, or there would be an emancipation only with the conditioned Brahman.

Moreover, if all objects are regarded as illusory impositions on pure Brahman, then in the comprehension of these objects the pure Brahman must also be comprehended. The scriptures also say: "Brahman is to be perceived with the mind and with the keen intellect" (*manasai'vā'nudraṣṭavyam... dṛśyate tvagrayā buddhyā*). There are also scriptural passages which say that it is the pure Brahman which is the object of meditation (*taṁ paśyati niṣkalam dhyāyamānam*).

Again, if perceivability or intelligibility determining falsehood is defined as relationing with consciousness, then since pure consciousness is supposed to have a relationing through illusion it also is liable to the charge of being perceivable. In this connection it is

difficult to conceive how Brahman, which has no opposition to *ajñāna*, can have an opposing influence against it when it is in conjunction with a mental state or *vytti*. Instead of such an assumption it might as well be assumed that the object itself acquires an opposing influence to its own ignorance when it is in association with a mental state having the same content as itself. On such a supposition perceivability does not consist in relation with consciousness as conditioned by mental state, for the conditioning has a bearing on the object and not on the consciousness. Thus it may well be assumed that an object becomes perceivable by being conditioned by a mental state of its own content. The assumption that the *vytti* or the mental state must be reflected on pure consciousness is unnecessary, for it may well be assumed that the ignorance is removed by the mental state itself. An object comes into awareness when it is represented by a mental state, and in order to be aware of anything it is not necessary that the mental state, idea or representation should be reflected in consciousness. Again, if Brahman cannot be its own object, it cannot also be termed self-luminous. For self-luminous means that it is manifest to itself independently, and this involves the implication that the Brahman is an object to itself. If that which is not an object to itself can be called self-luminous, then even material objects can be called self-luminous. Moreover, in the differenceless Brahman there cannot be any immediacy or self-luminousness apart from its nature (*nirviśeṣe brahmaṇi svarūpa-bhinnā-parokṣasya abhāvena*).

In the monistic view the self is regarded as pure knowledge which has neither a subject nor an object. But that which is subject-less and object-less can hardly be called knowledge, for knowledge is that which manifests objects. If that which does not manifest objects can be called knowledge, even a jug can be called knowledge. Again, the question naturally arises whether, if knowledge be regarded as identical with the self, such knowledge is valid or invalid; if it be valid, then the *ajñāna* which shines through it should also be valid, and if it be invalid, then that must be due to some defects and there are no such defects in the self. If it is neither false nor right knowledge, it would not be knowledge at all. Again, if the world-appearance is an illusion, then it must be an imposition on the Brahman. If Brahman be the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) of the illusory imposition, then it must be an entity that is known in a general

manner but not in its details. But Brahman is not an entity of which we can have either any general or specific knowledge. Brahman cannot therefore be regarded as the basis of the imposition of any illusion. In this connection it has further to be borne in mind that if the world were non-existent then it could not have appeared in consciousness; the chimerical entities are never perceived by anyone. The argument that even the illusory snake can produce real fear is invalid, for it is not the illusory snake that produces fear but the real knowledge of snakes that produces it. The child is not afraid of handling even a real snake, for it has no knowledge of snakes and their injurious character. Even dreams are to be regarded as real creation by God and not illusory impositions. The argument that they are false since they can only be perceived by the dreamer and not by others who are near him is invalid, for even the feelings and ideas felt or known by a person cannot be perceived by others who are near him<sup>1</sup>.

The world is thus not an illusory imposition on the pure Brahman, but a real transformation of the varied powers of God. The difference of this view from that of Sāṃkhya is that while the Sāṃkhya believes in the transformation of certain primary entities in their entirety, the Nimbārkaists believe in the transformation of the various powers of God. God Himself remains unchanged and unmodified, and it is only His powers that suffer modification and thereby produce the visible world<sup>2</sup>.

The explanation that the world is produced through the reflection of Brahman in *māyā* or by its limitation through it is invalid, for since the *māyā* is an entity of an entirely different order, there cannot be any reflection of Brahman in it or a limitation by it. It is not possible to bind down a thief with a dream-rope.

### Vanamālī Miśra.

Vanamālī Miśra, a native of Triyaga, a village within two miles of Brindavan, of Bharadvāja lineage, in his *Vedānta-siddhānta-saṃgraha*, called also *Śruti-siddhānta-saṃgraha*, gives some of the important tenets of the Nimbārka school. The work is written in the form of *Kārikās* and a commentary on it and is based on the commentary on the *Brahma-sūtra* by Nimbārka and other commentaries on it.

<sup>1</sup> *Para-pakṣa-giri-vajra*, p. 420.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 429.

He regards sorrow as being due to attachment to things that are outside one's own self, and the opposite of it as happiness<sup>1</sup>. All actions performed with a view to securing any selfish end, all performance of actions prohibited by Vedic injunctions and non-performance of duties rendered obligatory by Vedas produce sins. The opposite of this and all such actions as may please God are regarded as producing virtue. It is the power of God which is at the root of all virtue and vice which operates by veiling the qualities of God to us. This nescience (*avidyā*) is real and positive and different in different individuals. It produces the error or illusion which consists in regarding a thing as what it is not; and it is this false knowledge that is the cause of rebirth<sup>2</sup>. This *avidyā* is different with different individuals. It is through this *avidyā* that one gets attached to one's possession as "mine" and has also the false experience of individual freedom. In reality all one's actions are due to God, and when a person realizes this he ceases to have any attachment to anything and does not look forward for the fruits of his deeds. The *avidyā* produces the mind and its experiences of sorrows and pleasures; it also produces the false attachment by which the self regards the experiences as its own and ceases to realize its own nature as pure knowledge and bliss. Only the *videhi-muktas* enjoy this state; those in the state of *jīvanmukti* or sainthood enjoy it only to a partial extent. It is on account of attachments produced by ignorance that man is stirred to be led by the will of God. But as the ignorance is a true ignorance, so the experience of sorrow is also a true experience. All our rebirths are due to our actions performed against the mandates of the Vedas or for the fulfilment of our desires<sup>3</sup>. The purity of the soul is attained by the realization of the idea that all our actions are induced by God and that the performer has no independence in anything. When a person feels that it is through false association with other things, and by considering oneself as the real independent agent that one gets into trouble, one naturally loses all interest in one's actions and experience of

<sup>1</sup> *Sruti-siddhānta-saṃgraha*, 1. 9, 10, 11.

<sup>2</sup> *prati-jīvaṃ vibhinnā syāt satyā ca bhāva-rūpiṇī | a-tasmīns tad-dhiyo hetur midānaṃ jīva-saṃśṛtau.* || *Ibid.* 1. 15.

<sup>3</sup> *ataḥ kāmyaṃ niṣiddhaṃ ca duḥkh-avijāṃ tyajed budhaḥ.* *Sruti-siddhānta-saṃgraha*, 1. 63. According to Vanamālī Miśra at death a person goes to Heaven or to Hell according to his deeds and then after enjoying the fruits of his actions or suffering therefrom he is born as plants and then as lower animals, then as *Yavanas* or *mlecchas* and then in lower castes and finally as Brahmins.

pleasure and pain, and regards all objects as being invested with harmful defects. It is this disinclination or detachment that pleases God. The process of attaining devotion is also described in the scriptures as listening to the Upaniṣads (*śravaṇa*), realizing their meaning with logical persuasion (*manana*), and continual meditation on the nature of God as an unceasing flow (*nididhyāsana*)<sup>1</sup>. The last can come only as a result of the first two; for meditation involves a direct realization which is not possible without the performance of *śravaṇa* and *manana*. It is only through the purification of the mind by the above processes that God is pleased and makes Himself directly intuited (*aparokṣa*) by the devotee, just as one can intuit the musical melodies and tunes through musical discipline. This direct intuition is of the very nature of one's own self. For at this stage one has no functioning of the mind. The destruction of experiential knowledge is identical with the intuition of God. This stage therefore implies the annihilation of *avidyā* or the mind<sup>2</sup>. It is in this way that the nature of God as bliss is realized by man in his state of supreme emancipation; but even then it is not possible for him to know all the qualities of God, for even God Himself does not know all His qualities. Such an emancipation can be realized only through the grace of God. In the state of emancipation, man exists in God just as the fish swims about in the ocean. God creates because of the spontaneity of His grace and not in order to increase His grace; so also emancipated souls dally in God out of the spontaneity of their essence as bliss and not in order to increase their bliss<sup>3</sup>. The nature of God is always within us, and it is only when it is directly intuited that we can attain salvation. Some people attain emancipation in this world while others attain it in the upper worlds through which they pass as a result of their deeds. But emancipation of all kinds may be defined as the existence of man in his own nature as a result of the destruction of nescience<sup>4</sup>. The *jīvanmuktas* or saints are those whose *avidyā* has

<sup>1</sup> *anyā-rīta-viśayaḥ puro brahmā-kāra-dhiyām sadā  
nididhyāsana-sadbā-rtho jāyate sudhiyām hi saḥ.*

*Śruti-siddhānta-saṃgraha*, II. 13.

<sup>2</sup> *brahma-gocarasya vedānta-vāsita-manasi utpannasya ā-parokṣyasya yaḥ  
prāga-bhavaḥ tasya abhāvo dhvaṃso jñāna-tad-dhvaṃsā-nyatara-rūpo jñāna-  
brahmaṇaḥ sambandhaḥ, saṃsāra-daśāyām nāsti.* *Ibid.* II. 19.

<sup>3</sup> *ānando-dreḥato viṣṇoryathā sṛstyā-di-ceṣṭanam.*

*tathā mukta-citām kṛtā na tv ānanda-vivṛddhaye.* *Ibid.* II. 37.

<sup>4</sup> *sva-rūpeṇa sthitir muktir ajñāna-dhvaṃsa-pūrvakam* (*Ibid.* II. 58). This *mukti* can be of four kinds: *sārūpya*, i.e. the same external form as Kṛṣṇa;

been destroyed, but who have still to suffer the effects of their *prārabdha karma*. The realization of God can destroy the *sañcita* and *kriyamāṇa karma*, i.e. previously collected *karma* and those that are performed in the present life, but not the *prārabdha karma*, i.e. the *karma* that is already in a state of fruition.

It is wrong to suppose that the attainment of a state of bliss can be desired by any person; the state desired can only be one in which a person enjoys unobstructed bliss<sup>1</sup>. In a state of deep dreamless sleep one can enjoy a little bliss, but not the full bliss, as the *māyāvādins* hold. There is but little difference between the *māyāvādins* and the Buddhists; the difference is only in the mode of expression<sup>2</sup>.

The self is regarded as atomic, but its existence is definitely proved by the notion of the ego (*ahaṃ-pratyayavedya*) who enjoys all his experiences. Even though he may be dependent upon God, yet he is a real and active agent who works through the influence of *avidyā*. The existence of the self is also proved by the continuity of experiences through all stages of life. The self-love manifested in all beings for selfish ends also shows that each person feels a self or soul within himself and that this self is also different in different individuals. The difference between *jīva* and *īśvara* is that the former is of little power and little knowledge and always dependent, and the latter is omniscient, omnipotent and independent; He makes the *jīvas* work or assert their supposed independence by His *avidyā*-power. The *jīvas* are thus different from God, but as they exist in Him at the time of emancipation and as all their actions are guided by the *avidyā*-power of God, they are regarded also as being

*sālokya*, i.e. existence in the same sphere as God; *sāyujya*, as being merged in God; *sāṃpiya*, as existence in proximity to God as associated with a particular form of Him. The merging in God called *sāyujya* should not be regarded as being unified with God. This merging is like the animals roaming in the forest. The emancipated beings are different from God, but exist in Him (*evam muktvā harer bhinna ramante tatra modataḥ* (*Ibid.* II. 61). They can thus come out of God also, and we hear of them as entering in succession the bodies of Aniruddha, Pradyumna, Saṃkarṣaṇa and Vāsudeva. Such emancipated beings are not associated with the creation and destruction of the worlds, but remain the same in spite of all cosmic changes. They are like the being of *Svetadvīpa* referred to in the Nārāyaṇīya section of the *Mahābhārata*. But they are still always under the control of God and do not suffer any sorrow on account of such control.

<sup>1</sup> *puruṣārthaṃ sukhitvaṃ hi na tv ānanda-svarūpatā. Śruti-siddhānta-saṃgraha*, II. 96.

<sup>2</sup> *meyato na viśeṣo'-sti māyi-saugatayor mate*

*bhaṅgī-mātra-bhidā tu syāt ekasminn api darśane. Ibid.* II. 136.

one with Him. The mind of the individual being a creation of God's *avidyā*, all His world experience is also due to God's activity. In His own nature as self the *jīvas*, the individuals, have the revelation of God's nature which is pure bliss. The existence of individuals in their own essential nature is therefore regarded as a state of salvation. The individuals in their essential nature are therefore of the nature of *sat*, *cit* and *ānanda*, and though atomic they can enjoy the experiences all over the body through their internal functioning just as a lamp illuminates the whole room by rays. The experience of sorrow also is possible through the expansion or dilatation of the mind (*antaḥ-karāṇa*) through the various parts of the body and by means of the help of *avidyā* by which the *jīva* wrongly identifies himself with other objects. As the relation of the self with other objects takes place through the *antaḥ-karāṇa* of each person the sphere of experience of each of the *jīvas* is limited by the functioning of his own *antaḥ-karāṇa*. The *antaḥ-karāṇa* is different in different persons.

The Upaniṣads speak of God as the all (*sarvaṃ khalv'idaṃ Brahma*), and this is due to the fact that He pervades all things and controls all things. It means that the souls are dependent on Him or maintained in Him (*tad-ādhāratva*), but it does not mean their identity with Him. God is Himself able to create all things by Himself; but for His pleasure, for His mere sportive dalliance, He takes the help of *prakṛti* and the destiny born out of the deeds of human beings as His accessories. Though God makes all persons act in the manner in which they do act, yet His directive control is regulated in accordance with the *adṛṣṭa* or the destiny of the human beings which is beginningless. The theory of *karma* doctrine herein suggested is different from that propounded by Patañjali. According to Patañjali and his commentators, the fruits of the deeds, i.e. pleasure or pain, are enjoyed by the persons while they are free to act by themselves. Here, however, the freedom of the individuals is controlled and limited by God in accordance with the previous good or bad deeds of the individual, which are beginningless. Thus in our ordinary life not only our pleasures and pains but also our power to do good or bad actions are determined by previous deeds and the consequent control of God.

## CHAPTER XXII

### THE PHILOSOPHY OF VIJÑĀNA BHIKṢU

#### A General Idea of Vijñāna Bhikṣu's Philosophy.

THE ultimate goal is not the cessation of sorrow, but the cessation of the experience of sorrow; for when in the state of emancipation one ceases to experience sorrow, the sorrow as such is not emancipated since it remains in the world and others suffer from it. It is only the emancipated individual who ceases to experience sorrow. The ultimate state of emancipation cannot be a state of bliss, for since there are no mental organs and no mind in this state there cannot be any experience of bliss. The self cannot itself be of the nature of bliss and be at the same time the experiencer of it. When it is said that self is of the nature of bliss (*ānanda*), the word bliss is there used in a technical sense of negation of sorrow.

Bhikṣu admits a gradation of realities. He holds that one is stabler and more real than the other. Since *paramātmā* is always the same and does not undergo any change or transformation or dissolution, he is more real than the *prakṛti* or *puruṣa* or the evolutes of *prakṛti*. This idea has also been expressed in the view of the Purāṇas that the ultimate essence of the world is of the nature of knowledge which is the form of the *paramātman*. It is in this essential form that the world is regarded as ultimately real and not as *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* which are changing forms; *prakṛti*, so far as it exists as a potential power in God, is regarded as non-existent but so far as it manifests itself through evolutionary changes it is regarded as existent. The state of emancipation is brought about by the dissociation of the subtle body consisting of the five *tammātras* and the eleven senses. Consequent upon such a dissociation the self as pure consciousness is merged in Brahman as the rivers mingle with the ocean, a state not one of identity but identity-in-difference. According to the Sāṃkhya, emancipation cannot be attained until the fruits of the *karmas* which have ripened for giving experiences of pleasure and pain are actually exhausted through experiencing them, i.e. even when ignorance or *avidyā* is destroyed the attainment of the emancipation is delayed until the *prārabdha*

*karma* is finished. The Yogin, however, can enter into an objectless state of meditation (*asamprajñāta yoga*) and this wards off the possibility of experiencing the *prārabdha karma*. From the state of *asamprajñāta samādhi* he can at will pass into a state of emancipation. The state of emancipation is reached not merely by realizing the purport of the text of the Upaniṣads but by philosophic wisdom attained through a reasoned process of thought and by the successive stages of *Yoga* meditation.

The world does not emanate directly from Brahman as pure consciousness, nor are the *kāla*, *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* derived from Brahman through transformatory changes (*pariṇāma*). Had the world come into being directly from Brahman, evil and sins would have been regarded as coming into being from it. With the association of *sattva* through the beginningless will of God at the beginning of the previous cycles the Brahman behaves as *Īśvara* and brings into actual being the *prakṛti* and the *puruṣa* which are already potentially existent in God, and connects the *prakṛti* with the *puruṣa*. The moment of God's activity in bringing out the *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* may be regarded as *kāla*. In this sense *kāla* is often regarded as the dynamic agency of God. Though *puruṣas* in themselves are absolutely static, yet they have a seeming movement as they are always associated with *prakṛti*, which is ever in a state of movement. *kāla* as the dynamic agency of God is naturally associated with the movement of *prakṛti*, for both the *prakṛti* and the *puruṣa* are in themselves passive and are rendered active by the dynamic agency of God. This dynamic agency is otherwise called *kāla*, and as such it is an eternal power existing in Brahman, like the *prakṛti* and *puruṣa*. In all other forms of actual existence *kāla* is determinate and conditioned, and as such non-eternal and to some extent imaginary. It is only as the eternal power that subsists in and through all the operations of dynamic activity that *kāla* may be called eternal. The *kāla* that produces the connection of the *prakṛti* and the *puruṣa* and also produces the *mahat* is non-eternal and therefore does not exist at the time of *pralaya* when no such connection exists. The reason for this is that the *kāla* that produces the connection between *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* is a determinate *kāla* which is conditioned, on the one hand by the will of God, and, on the other, by the effects it produces. It is this determinate *kāla* that can be designated as present, past and future. But the terms pre-

sent, past and future imply an evolutionary change and such a change implies activity; it is this activity as dissociated from the manifest forms of *kāla* as present, past and future that can be regarded as eternal<sup>1</sup>.

The reference to the *Atharva-Veda*, as noted below in the footnote, will show how the conception of time in very ancient eras reveals "time" as a separate entity or energy which has brought everything into being, maintains it, and destroys everything. The God, *parameṣṭhin* Brahman or *prajāpati* is said to be derived from it. In the *Maitrī Upaniṣad* we also hear of the conception of *kāla* or time as *akāla* or timeless. The timeless time is the primordial time which is only the pure energy unmeasured and immeasurable. It appears in a measurable form when, after the production of the sun from it, it is measured in terms of the movement of the sun. The entire course of natural phenomena is thus seen to be an emanation or manifestation of the energy of time undirected by any other superintendent. Such a conception of time seems to be of an atheistic character, for even the highest gods, the *parameṣṭhin* and the *prajāpati*, are said to be produced from it.

In the first chapter of the *amṛtāsana parvan* of the *Mahābhārata* there is a dialogue between Gautamī, whose son was bitten by a serpent, the hunter who was pressing for killing the serpent, the serpent, the *mṛtyu* or death and *kāla*. It appears from the dialogue that time is not only the propeller of all events by itself but all states of *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*, all that is moving and the unmoved in the heaven and in the earth, all our movements and cessation of movements, the sun, the moon, the waters, the fire, the sky, the earth, the rivers, the oceans and all that is being or not being are of the

<sup>1</sup> *Atharva-Veda*, xix. 54. In the *Atharva-Veda* time is regarded as a generator of the sky and the earth and all beings exist through time. *Tapas* and Brahman exist in time and time is the god of all. Time produced all creatures. The universe has been set in motion by time, has been produced by it and is supported in it. Time becoming Brahman supports *parameṣṭhin*. In the *Svetāsvatara Upaniṣad* time is regarded as being held by the sun as the ultimate cause. In the *Maitrī Upaniṣad*, vi. 14, it is said that from time all creatures spring, grow and decay. Time is a formless form (*kālāt sravanti bhūtāni, kālāt vṛddhiṃ prayānti ca. | kāle cā'staṃ niyacchanti kālo mūrtir amūrtimān*).

It is again stated in the same work that there are two forms of Brahman, Time and no-Time.

<sup>2</sup> That which is before the sun is no-Time and is devoid of parts, and that which is after the sun is Time with parts.

nature of time and brought into being by time and dissolved in time. Time is thus the original cause. Time, however, operates in accordance with the laws of *karma*; there is thus the beginningless relation between time and *karma* which determines the courses of all events. *Karma* in itself is also a product of time and as such determines the future modes of the operation of time. Here we have an instance of the second stage, the conception of time as the transcendental and immanent cause of all things. Here time is guided by *karma*. In the third stage of the conception of time, which is found in the *purāṇas* and also adopted by Bhikṣu, it is regarded as the eternal dynamic power inherent in Brahman and brought into operation by the will of God<sup>1</sup>.

The word *puruṣa* is often used in the scriptural text in the singular number, but that signifies only that it is used in a generic sense, cf. *Sāṃkhya-sūtra*, I. 154 (*nā' dvaita-śruti-virodho jāti-paratvāt*)<sup>2</sup>. The difference between the superior *puruṣa* or God and the ordinary *puruṣas* is that while the latter are subject to experiences of pleasure and pain as a result of the actions or *karma*, the former has an eternal and continual experience of bliss through its reflection from its *sattvamaya* body to itself. The ordinary *puruṣas*, however, have not the experience of pleasure and pain as of constitutive definition, for in the stage of saintliness (*jīvanmuktī*) they have no such experiences. God can, however, have an experience of the experiences of pleasure and pain of other *puruṣas* without having been affected by them. The ultimate principle or the Brahman is a principle of pure consciousness which underlies

<sup>1</sup> In the *Ahīrbudhnya-saṃhitā*, the work of the *Pañcarātra* school, *niyati* (destiny) and *kāla* (time) are the two manifestations of the power of transcendent *kāla* as arising from *aniruddha*. From this *kāla* first arises the *sattva-guṇa* and from that the *rajo-guṇa* and thence the *tamo-guṇa*.

It is further said that it is time which connects and separates. The *kāla* of course in its own turn derives its power from the self-perceiving activity (*sudarśana*) of Viṣṇu. That the *prakṛti* transforms itself into its evolutes is also due to the dynamic function of *kāla*.

The *Māhāra vṛtti* on the *Sāṃkhya-kārikā*, however, refers to the doctrine of *kāla* as the cause of the world (*kālaḥ sṛjati bhūtāni, kālaḥ saṃharate prajāḥ | kālaḥ suptēṣu jāgarti tasmāt kālas tu hāraṇam*) and refutes it by saying that there is no separate entity as *kāla* (*kālo nāma na kaś cit padārtho'sti*), there are only three categories, *vyakta*, *avyakta* and *puruṣa*, and *kāla* falls within them (*vyaktam avyaktam puruṣa iti trayaḥ eva padārthāḥ tatra kālo antarbhūtaḥ*).

<sup>2</sup> The *Ahīrbudhnya-saṃhitā*, however, explains the singular number by the concept of a conglomeration of *puruṣa* or a colony of cells, as the honey-comb, which behaves as a totality and also in a multiple capacity as separate cells. *Ahīrbudhnya-saṃhitā*, vi. 33.

the reality of both the *puruṣas*, *prakṛti* and its evolutes; and it is because they are emergent forms which have their essence in the Brahman that they can appear as connected together. The movement of the *prakṛti* is also ultimately due to the spontaneous movement of the pure consciousness, the basic reality.

The *viveka* and the *aviveka*, the distinction and the non-distinction, are all inherent in *buddhi*, and this explains why the *puruṣas* fail to distinguish themselves from the *buddhi* with which they are associated. The association of the *puruṣas* with the *buddhi* implies that it has in it both the characters of distinction and non-distinction. The difficulty is that the "revelation of the distinction" is so opposed by the force of non-distinction that the former cannot find scope for its manifestation. It is the purpose of *yoga* to weaken the force of the tendency towards non-distinction and ultimately uproot it so that revelation of distinction may manifest itself. Now it may be asked what is the nature of this obstruction. It may be replied that it is merely a negative condition consisting in the non-production of the cognition of the distinction through association with the products of *prakṛti*, such as attachment and antipathy, through which we are continually passing. The Sāṃkhya, however, says that the non-production of the distinction is due to the extreme subtleness of the nature of *buddhi* and *puruṣa* which so much resemble each other that it is difficult to distinguish their nature. But this view of the Sāṃkhya should not be interpreted as meaning that it is only the subtleness of the natures of these two entities that arrests our discriminating knowledge regarding them. For had it been so, then the process of *yoga* would be inefficacious in attaining such a knowledge. The real reason is that our association with attachment and antipathy with regard to gross objects obstructs our discriminating vision regarding these subtle entities. Our attachment to gross objects is also due to our long association with sense-objects. A philosopher, therefore, should try to dissociate himself from attachment with gross objects. The whole purpose of creation consists in furnishing materials for the experiences of *puruṣa* which seems to undergo all experiential changes of enjoyment and suffering, of pleasure and pain, in and through the medium of *buddhi*. With the dissociation of *buddhi*, therefore, all experience ceases. The God is essentially pure consciousness, and though the knowledge of Him as such

brings about liberation, yet epithets of omnipotence, all-pervasiveness and other personal characteristics are attributed to Him because it is through an approach to God as a super-personal Being that devotion is possible, and it is through devotion and personal attachment that true knowledge can arise. It is said in the scriptures that God cannot be realized by *tapas*, gifts or sacrifices, but only by *bhakti*<sup>1</sup>. The highest devotion is of the nature of love (*attyuttamā bhaktiḥ prema-lakṣaṇā*).

God remains within all as the inner controller and everything is revealed to His super-consciousness without the mediation of sense-consciousness. God is called all-pervasive because He is the cause of all and also because He is the inner controller.

*Bhakti* consists in the whole process of listening to God's name, describing His virtues, adoration to Him, and meditation ultimately leading to true knowledge. These are all to be designated as the service of God. These processes of operations constituting *bhakti* are all to be performed with love. Bhikṣu quotes *Garuḍa purāṇa* to prove that the root "*bhā*" is used in the sense of service. He also refers to the *Bhāgavata* to show that the true *bhakti* is associated with an emotion which brings tears to the eyes, melts the heart and raises the hairs of the body. Through the emotion of *bhakti* one dissolves oneself as it were and merges into God's existence, just as the river Ganges does into the ocean.

It will be seen from the above that Bhikṣu urges on the doctrine of *bhakti* as love, as a way to the highest realization. The metaphysical views that he propounded give but small scope for the indulgence of such an attitude towards divinity. For, if the Ultimate Reality be of the nature of pure consciousness, we cannot have any personal relations with such a Being. The ultimate state of realization is also the entrance into a state of non-difference with this Ultimate Being, who is not Himself a person, and therefore no personal relations ought to be possible with Him. In the *Vijñāna-mṛta-bhāṣya*, IV. 1. 3, Bhikṣu says that at the time of dissolution or emancipation the individuals are not associated with any content of knowledge, and are therefore devoid of any consciousness, and being of the nature of unconscious entities like wood or stone they

<sup>1</sup> *aham prakṛṣṭaḥ bhaktito'anyaḥ sādhanaiḥ draṣṭum na śakyah, bhaktir eva kevalā mad-darśane sādhanam.*

*Īśvara-gītā-tīkā* (MS. borrowed from N. N. Gopinātha Kavirāja, late Principal, Queen's College, Benares).

enter into the all-illuminating great Soul just as rivers enter into the ocean. Again, it is this great Soul that out of its own will sends them forth like sparks of fire and distinguishes them from one another and goads them to action<sup>1</sup>. This great Soul or *paramātman* is the inner-controller and mover of our selves. But it may be remembered that this great Soul is not also the Ultimate Principle, the pure consciousness, but is the manifestation of the pure consciousness in association with the *sattvamaya* body. Under the circumstances the metaphysical position does not allow of any personal relation between the human beings and the Ultimate Entity. But yet the personal relation with the divinity as the ultimate consciousness not being philosophically possible, that relation is ushered in more out of a theistic tendency of Bhikṣu than as a necessary natural conclusion. The theistic relation is also conceived in a mystical fashion in the indulgence of the emotions of love rising to a state of intoxication. Such a conception of Divine love is found in the *Bhāgavata-purāṇa*; and later on in the school of Vaiṣṇavism preached by Caitanya. It is different from the conception of devotion or *bhakti* as found in the system of Rāmānuja, where *bhakti* is conceived as incessant continual meditation. He seems to have been, therefore, one of the earliest, if not the earliest, exponent of emotionalism in theism, if we do not take into account the Purāṇic emotionalism of the *Bhāgavata-purāṇa*. There are instances in the writings of modern European philosophers also, where the difficult position does not justify an emotionalism that is preached merely out of the theistic experiences of a personal nature, and as an illustration one may refer to the idea of God of Pringle Pattison. In the conception of *jīva* or individuals also there seems to be an apparent contradiction. For while the *puruṣas* are sometimes described as pure consciousness, they are at other times described as inert and wholly under the domination of *paramātman*. The contradiction is to be solved by the supposition that the inertness is only relative, i.e. the *puruṣas* are to be regarded as themselves inactive, being goaded to action by the inlying controller,

<sup>1</sup> *tasmāt pralaya-mokṣā-dau viṣaya-sambandhā-bhāvāt kṣṛṣṭha-loṣṭrā-dīvat jadāh sānto jīvā madhyandinā-dityavat sadā sarvā-vabhāśake paramā-tmani viltiyante samudre nada-nadya iva punasca sa eva paramā-tmā sve-cchayā gni-viśphul īṅgavat tā-nupāyi-sambandhena svato vibhajyāntaryāmi sa na prevayati tathā coktaṃ cakṣuṣmatā'ndhā iva nityamānā iti atah sa eva mukhya ātmā-ntaryāmy amṛtaḥ. Viññāna-mṛta-bhāṣya, IV. 1. 3.*

*paramātmān*. They are called “*jaḍa*,” resembling stone or wood only in the sense that they are inactive in themselves. But this inactivity should not be associated with want of consciousness. Being sparks of the eternal consciousness they are always of the nature of consciousness. Their activity, however, is derived from the *paramātmān*, so that, drawn by Him, they come out of the Eternal consciousness and play the role of a mundane individual and ultimately return to Brahman like rivers into the ocean at the time of emancipation. This activity of God is an eternal activity, an eternal creative impulse which is absolutely without any extraneous purpose (*carama-kāraṇasya kṛteḥ nityatvāt*)<sup>1</sup>. It proceeds from the spontaneous joy of God in a spontaneous manner like the process of breathing, and has no reference to the fulfilment of any purpose. In the *Vyāsa-bhāṣya* it is said that the creation of God is for the benefit of living beings. But Bhikṣu does not support any purpose at all. This activity is sometimes compared with the purposeless playful activity. But Bhikṣu says that even if there is any slight purpose in play that also is absent in the activity of God. The action also proceeds spontaneously with the creative desire of God, for which no body or senses are necessary. He is identical with the whole universe and as such His action has no objective outside of Himself, as in the case of ordinary actions. It is He who, depending upon the beginningless *karma* of human beings, makes them act for good or for evil. The *karma* itself, also being a part of His energy and a manifestation of His impulse, cannot be regarded as limiting His freedom<sup>2</sup>. The analogy of the doctrine of grace where the king bestows his grace or withholds it in accordance with the good or bad services of his servants is also regarded as helpful to conceive of the freedom of God in harmony with the deeds of the individual. If it is argued now, if the creative activity of God is eternal, it can depend on the *karma*, Bhikṣu's reply is that the *karmas* act as accessory causes determining the eternal creative impulse of God as producing pleasurable and painful experiences. Following the trend of the Purāṇic method Bhikṣu further suggests that it is the Hiraṇyagarbha created by God who appears as the law-giver of the law of *karma*, as manifested in the spontaneous activity of God. It is He, therefore, who is responsible for the suffering of humanity

<sup>1</sup> See *Vijñāna-mṛta-bhāṣya*, II. 1. 32.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* II. 1. 33.

in accordance with their *karmas*. God helps the process only by letting it go on in an unobstructed manner<sup>1</sup>. In another passage he says that God perceives within Himself as parts of Him the *jīvas* and their conditioning factors (*upādhi*) as associated with merit and demerit (*dharma* and *adharma*); associating these conditions with the *jīvas* He brings them out of Himself. He is thus the maker of souls, just as the potter is the maker of pots<sup>2</sup>.

The self is regarded as being itself untouchable and devoid of any kind of association (*a-saṅga*). The association between *prakṛti* and *puruṣa*, therefore, is not to be interpreted in the sense of a direct contact in the ordinary sense of the term, but the association is to be understood only as transcendental reflection through the conditioning factors which make the pure soul behave as a phenomenal self or *jīva*. The self has no knowledge as its quality or character, and is in itself pure consciousness, and there is at no time a cessation of this consciousness, which exists even during dreamless sleep. But in dreamless sleep there is no actual knowledge, as there is no content present at the time; and it is for that reason that the consciousness though present in the very nature of the self cannot be apperceived. The *vāsanās* or desires existing in the *antaḥkaraṇa* cannot affect the pure soul, for at that time the *antaḥkaraṇa* remains in a dissolved condition. Knowledge of contents or objects is possible only through reflections from the states of the *buddhi*. The pure consciousness being identical with the self, there cannot also be the self-consciousness involving the notion of a duality as subject and object during dreamless sleep. The pure consciousness remains the same and it is only in accordance with changes of mental state that knowledge of objects arises and passes away<sup>3</sup>. The *jīvas* are thus not to be regarded as themselves the products of the reflection of *paramātman* as the Śāṅkarites suppose; for in that case the *jīvas* would be absolutely unreal, and bondage and emancipation would also be unreal.

<sup>1</sup> *Vijñāna-mṛta-bhāṣya*, II. 1. 33.

<sup>2</sup> *Īśvaro hi svā-mā-sva-śarīrā-mā-tulyau jīva-tad-upādhi svā-ntar-gatau dharmā-di-sahitau sākṣād eva paśyann a-para-tantraḥ sva-līlayā samyoga-viśeṣaṁ brahmā-dīnām api dur-vibhāvyaṁ kurvat kumbhakāra iva ghaṭam. Ibid.* II. 1. 13.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* II. 3. 5.

### The Brahman and the World according to Vijñānā-mṛta-bhāṣya.

The production, existence, maintenance, modification, decay and destruction of the world are from Brahman as God. He holds within Himself all the energies constituting the *prakṛti* and *puruṣas*, and manifests Himself in other diverse forms; Brahman as pure consciousness is associated with the conditioning factor of His own being, the *māyā* as pure *sattva* quality in all this creative activity, so from that great Being who is devoid of all afflictions, *karmas* and their fruits are also produced. The fact that the *Brahma-sūtra*, II. 2, says that Brahman is that from which the world has come into being and is being maintained implies that the world as it is in its own reality is an eternal fact in the very being of the ultimately real and the unmanifested. The production, the transformation and the destruction of the world are only its phenomenal aspect<sup>1</sup>. Brahman is here regarded as the *adhiṣṭhāna-kāraṇa*. This means that Brahman is the basis, the ground, the *ādhāra* (container) as it were of the universe in which it exists as undivided and as indistinguishable from it and which also holds the universe together. Brahman is the cause which holds together the material cause of the universe so that it may transform itself into it<sup>2</sup>. Brahman is the principle of ultimate cause which renders all other kinds of causality possible. In the original Brahman, the *prakṛti* and the *puruṣas* exist in the eternal consciousness and as such are held together as being one with it. The Brahman is neither changeable nor identifiable with *prakṛti* and *puruṣa*. It is because of this that, though Brahman is of the nature of pure consciousness and unchangeable, yet it is regarded as being one with the universe and as the material cause. The material cause or *upādāna-kāraṇa* is the name which is given to changing material cause (the *vikāri-kāraṇa*) and to the ground cause or the *adhiṣṭhāna-kāraṇa*. The underlying principle of both the ground cause (*adhiṣṭhāna-kāraṇa*) and the material cause (*upādāna-kāraṇa*) is that the effect is held in it as merged in it or

<sup>1</sup> *atra cai'tad yata ity'anuktuā janmā-dyasya yata iti vacanād avyakta-rūpeṇa jagan nityam eva ity ācāryyā-śayaḥ. Vijñānā-mṛta-bhāṣya, I. 1. 2.*

<sup>2</sup> *kiṃ punar adhiṣṭhāna-kāraṇatvam ucyate tad evā' dhiṣṭhāna-kāraṇam yatra' vibhaktam yeno' paṣṭabdham ca tad upādāna-kāraṇam kāryā-kāreṇa pāriṇamate. Ibid.*

indistinguishable from it<sup>1</sup>. The idea involved in *avibhāga* or oneness with the cause is not regarded as an ordinary relation of identity but as a sort of non-relational relation or a situation of uniqueness which cannot be decomposed into its constituents so that a relational bond may be affirmed of them. The upshot of the whole position is that the nature of the universe is so founded in Brahman which forms its ground that it cannot be regarded as a mere illusory appearance of it or as a modification or a product of it; but while these two possible ways of relation between the cause and the effect fail, the universe as such has no existence, significance or meaning without the ground in which it is sustained and which helps its evolutionary process. The ordinary relation of the sustainer and the sustained is inadequate here, for it implies a duality of independent existence; in the present case, however, where Brahman is regarded as the ground cause there is no such duality and the universe cannot be conceived as apart from Brahman which forms its ground and essence while remaining unchanged in its transcendent reality. Thus, though it may have to be acknowledged that there is a relation between the two, the relation has to be conceived as the transcendental one, of which no analogy is found elsewhere. The seeming pictorial analogy which falls far short of the situation is to be found in the case where water is mixed with milk<sup>2</sup>. Here the existence of the water is dependent upon the existence of the milk so long as the two exist in a mixed condition; and neither of them can be conceived without the other. The nature of the *prakṛti* and the *puruṣa* is also manifested from the essence of God's nature as pure consciousness. The causality of substance, qualities and actions is also due to the underlying essence of God which permeates all things. The difference between the relation of *samavāya* and this unique relation of indistinguishableness in the ground is that while the former applies to the case of the intimate relation of the effects in and through themselves, the latter refers only to the special fact of the indistinguishable character of the effect in the cause, and has no reference to the relation of the effect-parts among themselves with reference to the whole as an inseparable concatenation of effects. The ordinary organic relation such

<sup>1</sup> *Kāryā-vibhāgā-dhāratvasyai' vo' pādāna-sāmānya-lakṣaṇatvāt. Vijñāna-mṛta-bhāṣya*, I. 1. 2.

<sup>2</sup> *avibhāgaś' cā' dhāratvāt svarūpa-sambandha-viśeṣo' tyanta-sammitraṇa-rūpo dugdha-jalādy-ekatā-pratyaya-niyāmakah. Ibid.*

as that which subsists between the parts of a living body is thus different from that which is referred to here as the indistinguishable character of the effects in the ground. The parts of the universe as comprising the living and the non-living may be regarded as inseparably united with one another in the whole, but such a relation is an intimate relation between the effects, and the whole is nothing but an assemblage of these. This is what may be called the special feature of *samavāya* relation. But in the unique relation of indistinguishableness in the ground the effect subsists in the ground in such a manner that the effect has no separate reality from the cause<sup>1</sup>. Brahman in this view is the basis or the substratum—the ground which supports the totality of the unity of *prakṛti* and the *puruṣas* to evolve itself into the universe with its varied forms<sup>2</sup>. It does not, therefore, in itself participate in the changing evolution and transformation of world-forms, but it always exists as one with it, and being in it and supported by it, it develops into the world.

Vijñāna Bhikṣu says that the Vaiśeṣikas believe that God is the dynamic or the instrumental agent, whereas he thinks that the causality of God cannot be regarded as being either of the *samavāyi*, *asamavāyi* or *nimitta* types, but is a fourth kind of conception—cause as ground or container<sup>3</sup>. He also describes this type of causation as being *adhiṣṭhāna*, a term with which we are familiar in Śāṅkara Vedānta. But the difference between the two kinds of conception of *adhiṣṭhāna kāraṇa* is indeed very great, for while Bhikṣu considers this to be the unchangeable ground which sustains the movements of the principle of change in it in an undivided unity, Śāṅkara regards *adhiṣṭhāna* as the basis of all changes which are unreal in themselves. According to Bhikṣu, however, the changing phenomena are not unreal, but they are only changes which are the modifications of a principle of change which subsists in an undivided unity with the ground cause. When they say that the world is both being and non-being (*sad-asadrūpa*), and is hence unreal and illusory, the Śāṅkarites suffer from a grave misconception. The

<sup>1</sup> *tatra samavāya-sambandhena yatrā' vibhāgas tad vikāri-kāraṇam; yatra ca kāryasya kāraṇā'vibhāgena avibhāgas tad adhiṣṭhāna-kāraṇam. Ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> *yadi hi paramā-tmā dehavat sarvaṃ kāraṇam nā'dhitiṣṭheta tarhi dravya-guṇa-karmā-di-sādhāraṇā-khila-kārye itthaṃ mūla-kāraṇam na syāt. Īśvara-gītā-bhāṣya. MS.*

<sup>3</sup> *asmābhis tu samavāyī-asamavāyībhyāṃ udāsīnaṃ nimitta-kāraṇebhyaś ca vilakṣaṇatayā caturtham ādhāra-kāraṇatvam. Ibid.*

world is called *sat* and *asat* (being and non-being), because it represents the principle of becoming or change. It is affirmed as "this" and yet because it changes it is again not affirmed as "this." The future forms of the changing process are also non-existent as it were in the present form and the present form is also non-existent as it were in the future forms that are to be. Thus, any of its forms may be regarded as not existing and hence false when compared with an entity that always exists and in the same form<sup>1</sup>. All objects of the world so far as they are past and future are contradicted by their present states and are therefore regarded as false, but so far as they are perceived in their present state they are regarded as real<sup>2</sup>.

The universe has, however, an eternal and immutable form as pure consciousness in the very nature of Brahman from which it is separated out as the world of matter and souls. The pure consciousness in itself is the only ultimate reality which is ever the same and is not subject to any change or process of becoming. Both the individual souls and the world of matter are ultimately dissolved and merged in Brahman, the pure and ultimate consciousness. These, therefore, are regarded as being names and forms when compared with the ultimate changeless Reality, Brahman<sup>3</sup>. But this does not mean that the universe of matter and souls is absolutely unreal and mere *māyā* or illusion. If all that appears were absolutely false, then all moral values would disappear and all notions of bondage and emancipation would become meaningless. If the falsity of all things except the pure consciousness can be proved by any means, that itself would prove that such proofs have validity and that therefore there are other things over and above pure consciousness which may be valid. If such proofs are invalid but can establish the validity of pure consciousness as against the validity of all other things, then such proofs may also prove the reality of all other things in the world. It may be held that what ordinary people consider as true can be proved to be invalid by what is regarded by them as valid means of proof; but on the Śāṅkarite view nothing is regarded as valid and therefore there are

<sup>1</sup> *eka-dharmena sattva-daiśāyām pariṇāmi-vastūnām atītā-nāgata-dharmena asattvāt. Vijñānā-mṛta-bhāṣya*, I. 1. 3.

<sup>2</sup> *ghaṭā-dayo hi anāgatā-dy-avasthāsu vyaktā-dy-avasthābhir bādhyante iti. ghaṭā-dayo mithyā-śabdena ucyante vidyamāna-dharmāḥ ca tadānām na bādhyante iti satyā ity api ucyante. Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *jñāna-svarūpaḥ paramā-tmā sa eva satyaḥ jñvāś cā'mśatayaḥ amśiny ekibhūtaḥ athavā' vāyavattvena paramā-tmā-pekṣayā te' py asantaḥ. Ibid.*

no proofs by which the validity of the world-process can be maintained. But the reply that naturally comes to such a view is that though the validity of the world may not be proved, yet that does not lead to the conclusion that the world-process is unreal; for even if its validity is not proved, its validity or reality may at least be doubtful. There is, therefore, nothing by which we may come to any conclusion about its invalidity and unreality. The reality of the universe is of a different order from that of Brahman, which is of the nature of pure consciousness, as the former consists of practical efficiency (*artha-kriyā-kāritva*). But even though in the state of a changing process the reality of the world is only its reality as becoming and as causal efficiency, yet it has also an ultimate reality in itself, since it has come into being from the ultimate reality, Brahman. The world of matter and souls exists in God as pure consciousness and therefore as one with Him. When from out of its state as pure consciousness it is manifested as the world of matter and souls, we mark it as the stage of creation. When again they retire back into God as being one with His consciousness, that is marked as the state of dissolution<sup>1</sup>. The universe of matter and souls is also ultimately to be regarded as being of the nature of consciousness, and is as such a constituent of the ultimate pure consciousness in which it remains as it were merged and lost. The world of visible forms and changes is also thus of the nature of thought, and only the ignorant regard them as mere objects<sup>2</sup>. When the scriptural texts speak of the identity of the world and Brahman they refer to this ultimate state in which the world exists in the pure consciousness—Brahman as one with it. But it is not only in the state of dissolution that the world exists in Brahman in undivided unity, but in the state of creation also the world exists in Brahman as one with it, for all the so-called mechanical and other kinds of forces that are to be found in matter and which constitute its reality are but the energy of God. And as the energy is always conceived as being one with that which possesses it, it is believed that the world with all its changes exists in God<sup>3</sup>. In the state of

<sup>1</sup> *pralayeḥi puṁ-prakṛtyā-dikaṁ jñāna-rūpeṇai'va rūpyate na tv artha-rūpeṇa arthato vyañjaka-vyāpārā-bhāvāt. Vijñānā-mṛta-bhāṣya, I. I. 4.*

<sup>2</sup> *jñāna-svarūpaṁ akhilaṁ jagad etad abuddhayaḥ I. artha-svarūpaṁ paśyanto bhrāmyante moha-saṁplave. Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *śaktimat-kārya-kāraṇā-bhedenai'va brahmā-dvaitaṁ bodhayanti. . . ayaṁ ca śarva-kālo brahmaṇi prapañcā-bhedaḥ. Ibid.*

*pralaya* the world-energies exist in God as some form of consciousness or conscious energy which is later on manifested by Him as material energy or matter. The unity of the world-energies in God is such that though these retain some kind of independence yet it is so held up and mixed up as it were in the reality of God that it cannot be separated from Him. Their independence consists in the fact that they are of the nature of energy, but as God possesses them they can have no existence and they cannot be conceived as apart from Him. As thus described the world of matter has no permanent reality, and the consciousness of this fact may be called the *bādhā* or contradiction (*pāramārthika-sattvā-bhāva-niścaya eva bādhah*)<sup>1</sup>. But in spite of this *bādhā* the universe has a relative or *vyavahārika* existence (*tādrśa-bādhe'pi ca sati jñāna-sāadhanā-dīnām vyavahārika-sattvāt*).

The causality of *prakṛti* and *paruṣa* is limited to their specific capacities which determine the nature of modifications. But God is the universal all-cause behind them which not only shows itself through these specific limitations but which regulates the inner harmony and order subsisting in them and in their mutual relations. Thus the visual organ is limited in its function to the operation of vision, and the tactile organ is limited in its function to the operation of touch, but the functions and activities of all these are organized by the individual self which operates and manifests itself through them. Thus Brahman in this sense may be regarded as being both the instrumental and the material cause<sup>2</sup>. According to Sāṃkhya and Yoga the *prakṛti* is supposed to be associated with the *puruṣas* through the inner and inherent teleology, but according to the Vedāntic view as interpreted by Bhikṣu their mutual association is due to the operation of God<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> *Vijñāna-mṛta-bhāṣya*, I. 1. 4.

<sup>2</sup> *brahmaṇas tu sarva-śaktikatuāt tat-tad-upādhibhiḥ sarva-kāraṇatvaṃ yathā cakṣurā-dīnām darśanā-di-kāraṇatvaṃ yat praty-ekam asti tat sarvaṃ sarvā-dhyakṣasya jīvasya bhavati, etena jagate' bhinna-nimitto-pādānattvaṃ vyākhyātam. Ibid. I. 1. 2.*

<sup>3</sup> *sāṃkhya-yogibhyaṃ puruṣa-rtha-prayuktā pravṛttiḥ svayam eva puruṣeṇa ādya-jīvena saṃyucyate... asmābhis tu prakṛti-puruṣa-saṃyoga īśvareṇa kriyate. Ibid.*

### The Individual.

In his commentary on the *Īśvara-gītā*, Bhikṣu says that the more universal has a wider sphere than the less universal and therefore it is called Brahman in relation to it. The cause of an effect is wider and more universal than the effect and is therefore called Brahman in comparison with it. Thus there is a hierarchy of Brahman. But that which is at the apex of the hierarchy is the highest universal and the ultimate cause, and is therefore called the highest Brahman. Brahman is thus the highest and the ultimate reality. The determinations that make the universe of matter exist in Brahman as merged in its nature as thought. Creation means that these determinations which exist there in a potential form and without any operation are manifested and made operative as the world of nature. God in His nature as pure consciousness has a full and complete acquaintance of all the possible developments and modifications of the pre-matter as evolving into the actual universe. The starting point in the evolution of the pre-matter or *prakṛti* is the moment of its association with the spirits. The scriptural text says that the Lord entered into the *prakṛti* and the *puruṣas*, disturbed the equilibrium and associated them with one another. The *puruṣas* are, however, like sparks of consciousness and it is not possible to produce any disturbance in them. The disturbance is thus produced in the *prakṛti* and the effect of such disturbance in the *prakṛti* on the *puruṣas* is interpreted as seeming disturbances in the *puruṣas* as well. The *puruṣas* are to be conceived as being parts of God and there cannot be a real identity between the *puruṣas* and the Brahman. The so-called identity between the *puruṣas* and the Brahman refers merely to the fact of the *puruṣas* being the constituent entities in the being of God such as that which exists between the parts and the whole. The assertion of the Śāṅkarites that the individual soul is the same as Brahman and that the difference is due to external limitations of nescience or on account of reflections through it is wrong. The kind of unity that exists between the individual souls and the Brahman lies in the fact that they are indistinguishable in character from it (*avibhāga*). If the reality of individual souls is denied, that would amount to a denial of religious and moral values and of bondage and emancipation.

In this connection it is also urged that the individual souls are derived from God just as sparks come out of fire or the son comes out of the father. The individual souls resemble God so far as they are of the nature of pure consciousness. But though they have come out of Him, yet they retain their individuality and thus preserves for them the sphere of their moral career. The individual souls are free and emancipated in their own nature, they are all-pervasive and they also hold the universe within them in their consciousness. In all these they share the nature of Brahman. But in association with the limiting conditions (*upādhi*) they appear as finite and limited. When the entire career of the individual souls is known as existing in Brahman as part of it, as being manifested out of it as separate entities, as leading a career of their own in association with the limiting conditions and ultimately dissociating themselves from them and realizing their own natures as one with Brahman and in a sense different from it, this is the true philosophic knowledge and realization of their own nature. When the individuals start their career and destiny in life they are different from Brahman; but there was a time when they remained in one undivided unity with Brahman. But in spite of this unity the Brahman is always felt as different and as the other of the individuals, and this difference is never sublated<sup>1</sup>. But the difference of this view from the Sāṃkhya is that the Sāṃkhya is satisfied only with considering the individuality and separateness of the *puruṣas*, but the Vedāntic view as interpreted herein cannot ignore the fact that in spite of their separateness they are one in essence with Brahman and have sprung out of it, and after the fulfilment of their career of individuality and destiny will again be merged in it, and even during their mundane career have an aspect of undividedness with Brahman inasmuch as they are the powers or energies of it<sup>2</sup>. The difference that exists between the individuals and Brahman is most apparent during the mundane career on account of the fact that the world of nature has a separate existence in the consciousness of the individual centres and each one of them is limited to his own experiences. But at the time of dissolution, when the world of nature merges in the Brahman as a potential level of its energies, the individuals are

<sup>1</sup> *bhedā-bhedau vibhāgā-vibhāga-rūpau kāla-bhedena aviruddhau anyonyā-bhāvaś ca jīva-brahmaṇor ātīyāntika eva. Vijñānā-mṛta-bhāṣya*, I. 1. 2.

<sup>2</sup> *ata idam brahmā-tma-jñānam vivikta-jīva-jñānāt sāmṛkhyo-ktād api fre-ṣṭham. Ibid.* I. 1. 2.

also merged in it and have no separate spheres of experience for themselves and thus cease to have any descriptive definition of themselves.

The nature of the relation of part and whole that exists between the individuals and Brahman is regarded as that subsisting between the son and the father. The father is reborn in the son. Before birth the son lies in a state of undivided unity in the vital energy of the father and yet when he separates out of him it is the same vital energy of the father that repeats itself in its new career and has a sphere of activity which is definitely its own. Again, when it is said that the individuals are parts of Brahman, it should not be interpreted to mean that they have any share in the existence of Brahman as God or world-creator. God is not homogeneous in His nature, but the element of individuation and differentiation always exists in Him. Had He been a homogeneous being His parts would have no specific differentiation and they would be like the parts of space which are always indistinguishable from one another. But the fact that God has within Him the principle of differentiation explains the fact that the individuals resemble Brahman only in the aspect of their consciousness but have no share in His creative functions or omnipotence. The Sāṃkhyaists hold that salvation is attained through dissociation of attachment as "mine" to one's experiences, mental faculties, senses, understanding and body, owing to one's knowledge of the fact that the self is the self-shining entity to which all experiences appear and within which they are held together as one with it though they are all different from it. But the Vedānta as herein interpreted holds that the attachment as "mine" vanishes with the knowledge of self as pure consciousness, with the knowledge of God as the being from which they come into being, by which they are maintained and into which they ultimately return, and with the knowledge that they all exist in the consciousness of God as parts of it; and that the self is not the real enjoyer of the experiences but is only the consciousness in which the universe and its experiences shine forth. Thus, though both in the Sāṃkhya and in the Vedānta as herein interpreted salvation is attained through the dissolution of the false attachment as "mine-ness," the dissolution of "mine-ness" is here due to an entirely different philosophic conception<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> *Vijñāna-mṛta-bhāṣya*, p. 56.

Consciousness is not a quality but it is the very substance of the self. Just as light is a substance which illuminates other things, so consciousness is also a substance which illuminates other things. When one says "I know it," knowledge appears to be a quality of "I" which is neither self nor a homogeneous entity. The "I" is a complex of sense-faculties, understanding, etc., to which a quality can be attributed; the self is not a complex entity, but a homogeneous simple substance—the consciousness. The complex entity, the "I," expresses all things by a manifestation of consciousness. Bliss or happiness, however, cannot be regarded as a self-revealing substance, but it is an independent substance like sorrow which is revealed by consciousness. Neither the Brahman nor the self can therefore be regarded as being of the nature of bliss or happiness as this is a modification of *prakṛti* and has therefore to be regarded as expressible (*dṛśya*) and not as expressing (*darśana*). The consciousness requires the intermediary of intellectual functions for the illumination of objects, but consciousness in itself does not require the intermediary of any other functions, as such a view would lead only to an infinite regressus without solving the point at issue. It is also wrong to suppose that the principle of consciousness exercises any operation in order to reveal itself, for an entity cannot operate on itself (*karma-kartṛ-virodhāt*). If for the above reasons the self cannot be regarded as being of the nature of bliss, then at the time of salvation also there cannot be any bliss in the self. There is only a cessation of sorrow at that time, or rather a cessation of both happiness and sorrow which is technically called a state of happiness or *sukha* (*sukham duḥkha-sukhā-tyayaḥ*)<sup>1</sup>. At the time of emancipation all conditioning factors such as the intellectual functions and the like are dissolved and as a consequence thereof all experiences of pleasure and pain also vanish, for these are substances belonging to objects which were presented to the self through these conditions. When the Upaniṣads say that the self is dearest to us, it need not necessarily be supposed that it is the pleasure that is dearest to us, for the self may be regarded as being valued for its own sake; it may also be supposed that pleasure here means the cessation of pain<sup>2</sup>. The desire for immortality or con-

<sup>1</sup> *Vijñāna-mṛtā-bhāṣya*, I. 1. 2.

<sup>2</sup> *ātmatvasyā'pi prema-prayojakatvāt duḥkha-nivṛtti-rūpattvād vā bodhyam. Ibid.*

tinued existence of the self illustrates the feeling of fondness that we all have for ourselves. The other view, that the ultimate object of realization is extermination of all sorrow is also not open to any objection on the ground that pleasure and pain never belonged to the selves; for the association of pleasure and pain is only with reference to their enjoyment and suffering and not directly as a bond of attachment to the self. The term "*bhoga*," which may be translated only semi-accurately as "experience," has a twofold application as referring to *buddhi* or psychosis and to *puruṣa*. The *prakṛti* is composed of *sukha*, *duḥkha* and *moha* substances, and *buddhi* is an evolute of the *prakṛti*; therefore, when the *buddhi* is in association with *sukha* or *duḥkha*, such an association supplies the *buddhi* with the stuff of which it is made and thus sustains and maintains its nature and constitution. But when the word *bhoga* has a reference to *puruṣa*, it means that the pleasure or sorrow held in the *buddhi* is reflected on it and is thereby intuited. It is this intuition of pleasure and pain through their reflection in the *puruṣa* that is regarded as their *bhoga* or experience by *puruṣa*. The *buddhi* cannot have any *bhoga* or experience, even in a remote sense of the term, for the simple reason that it is unconscious. But it may well be argued that since the *puruṣa* is not in reality the ego, it cannot have any experience in any real sense of the term; and since it cannot in reality have any experience of sorrow, it cannot in reality regard its cessation as being of the utmost value to it. The reply to such an objection is that the realization of the fact that the cessation of sorrow is of ultimate value to the experiencer, the *puruṣa*, leads the *suddhi* on its onward path of progress. Had it not been so there would be no movement of the *buddhi* on lines of utility. So though pleasure and pain do not belong to *puruṣa*, they may yet be experienced by it and the *buddhi* may be guided by such experiences.

When the Upaniṣad says "that art thou," the idea at the back of it is that the self is not to be identified with any of the elements of the psychosis—the *buddhi*—or with any of the evolutes of the *prakṛti*. The self is part of the pure consciousness—the Brahman. When a man learns from the Upaniṣad text or one's teacher that he is a part of Brahman he tries to realize it through a process of meditation. The difference of the Vedāntic view from that of Sāṃkhya is that the latter rests with the individual selves as the ultimate entities whereas the former emphasizes the Brahman as

the ultimate reality, and also the fact that the reality of all other things, the selves and the matter, depends ultimately on their participation in it.

### **Brahma-Experience and Experience.**

Cause may be defined as the productivity due to direct and immediate perception of the material cause. The *buddhi* is regarded as an effect because, like jugs and other things, it is produced through some direct and immediate intuition of its causal material. This naturally implies that the *buddhi* has a causal material which is directly perceived by some Being and to which His creative activity is directed and this Being is God. It is said in the *Brahma-sūtras* that Brahman can be known by the testimony of the scriptures. But this cannot be true, for the Upaniṣads say that the Brahman cannot be expressed by words or known by intellect. The reply to this is that the denial contemplated in such passages refers only to the fact that Brahman cannot be known in entirety or in its uniqueness by the scriptural texts, but these passages do not mean that it is not possible to have a generic knowledge of the nature of Brahman. It is only when we have such a generic knowledge from the scriptures that we enter the sphere from which we may proceed further and further through the processes of Yoga and have ultimately a direct intuitive apperception of it. The specific nature of God as devoid of any quality or character only means that His nature is different from the nature of all other things, and though such a nature may not be realized by ordinary perception, inference or other sources of knowledge, there cannot be any objection to its being apprehended by the intuition of Yoga meditation. There are some Vedāntists who think that the Brahman cannot be felt or apprehended intuitively, but there is a mental state or function (*vr̥tti*) which has the Brahman as its object. Such a mental state destroys the nescience and as a result of this the Brahman shines forth. But Bhikṣu objects to this and says that the *vr̥tti* or mental function is admitted for relating the consciousness or the self with the objects, but once this connection is effected the objects are directly apprehended; so, in order to bring Brahman within the sphere of knowledge, the intuitive apperception is in itself sufficient for the purpose. It cannot be held that, since Brahman is itself of

the nature of pure illumination, no special intuitive apprehension is necessary and that the existence of the mental function or *vyrtti* was admitted for explaining the dissolution of *ajñāna*; for Brahman, being of the nature of consciousness, can be realized only through intuitive apprehension which is itself of the nature of knowledge. Since all apprehension is direct and immediate, self-knowledge must also be of the same kind. There is also no necessity to assume a principle of obstruction which has to be overcome as a condition of the rise of knowledge. In the state of deep dreamless sleep a principle of obstruction in the shape of the function of *tamas* has to be admitted in order to explain the absence of knowledge which leads to the absence of all cognitive or practical behaviour. To the opponent's idea that since Brahman is self-luminous it cannot have any relation with anything else, and that since Brahman and the self are identical there cannot be any self-knowledge of Brahman, for the Brahman cannot be both the knower and the known, Bhikṣu's reply is that self-luminousness does not mean unrelatedness; and the absolute identity of the self and the Brahman cannot also be admitted, and even if it be admitted we can explain the method of Brahman-knowledge by the same manner in which our experiential knowledge or self-consciousness can be explained.

Bhikṣu thinks that since we do not find in the *Brahma-sūtras* any account of the origin and growth of knowledge, the Sāṃkhya-Yoga account of knowledge may well be accepted on account of the general affinity of the Sāṃkhya-Yoga ideas with the Vedānta. According to the Sāṃkhya-Yoga there is first a contact of the senses with their respective objects and as a result the *tamas* aspect of the *buddhi* is subordinated at the time; and the *buddhi* as pure *sattva* assumes the form of the object. This state of *buddhi* is called an objective state of the *buddhi* or a sensory idea or state (*sā buddhya-vasthā viśayā-kārā buddhi-vṛttir ity ucyate*). During dreams and contemplative states images of external objects arise in the mind and are directly perceived and therefore valid. The connection of the *puruṣa* with the external objects is thus effected through the intermediary of the *buddhi*. So long as the *buddhi* remains impure the *puruṣa* cannot get itself related to objects through it. It is for this reason that during deep sleep when the *buddhi* is dominated by *tamas* the *puruṣa*-consciousness cannot manifest itself or make itself related with other objects. As soon as the *buddhi* is

modified into a sensory or image-state it is reflected in the *puruṣa*, which then reveals it as a flash of conscious state. It is in this manner that the pure infinite consciousness can manifest itself into finite forms of objects. As the *buddhi* is constantly transforming itself into various forms and reflecting them on the *puruṣa* from beginningless time there is a continuous flow of conscious states only occasionally punctuated by dreamless sleep. The *puruṣa* in its turn is also reflected in the *buddhi* and thereby gives rise to the notion of ego. In this connection Bhikṣu criticizes the view of Vācaspati that the reflection of the *puruṣa* in the *buddhi* is sufficient to explain the cognitive situation, and says that a reflection of consciousness cannot itself be conscious and hence cannot explain why the states of *buddhi* should appear as conscious. But the assumption that the states of *buddhi* are reflected in the consciousness explains their real connection with consciousness. It may be said that since it is only the reflections that are associated with consciousness, the things as they exist are not known. The reply to such an objection is that the *buddhi*-states are but copies of the external objects; and if the copies are intelligized, we have in the validity of such direct acquaintance of the copies the guarantee of their application to objects. It may be said again that when the reflections of the *buddhi*-states in the consciousness appear as one with it and therefore produce the phenomenon of knowledge we have in such phenomena an illusory unity of the consciousness with the states; our knowledge then becomes illusory. The reply to such an objection is that even if there is an element of illusion in knowledge, that does not touch the reality and validity of the objects to which such knowledge refers. Valid knowledge (*pramā*) thus consists of this reflection of the *buddhi*-states in the *puruṣa*. The fruit of the cognitive process (*pramāṇa-phala*) belongs to the pure consciousness or the *puruṣa* who thus behaves as the knower, though he is absolutely unattached to all experiences. The Vaiśeṣikas lay stress on the appearance of knowledge as produced and destroyed and therefore regard knowledge as being produced or destroyed by the collocation of causes. The reflection of the mental states to *puruṣa* is explained by them as if the knowledge belonged to the self. The Vedāntic epistemological process in which the *puruṣa* appears to be the knower and the enjoyer is explained by them as being due to a separate cognitive process called *anu-vyavasāya*.

The transcendental experience of God has also to be explained on the basis of the origin of ordinary experiential knowledge. Through the understanding of the meaning of the scriptural texts and by the processes of Yoga there arises in the *buddhi* a modification of the form "I am Brahman." This valid form of modification, being reflected in the *puruṣa*, is revealed as an intuitive apperception of the fact as true self-knowledge belonging to *puruṣa*. The difference between ordinary experiential knowledge and this knowledge is that it destroys egoism (*abhimāna*). In such a conception of self-knowledge the objection that the self cannot be both the knower and the known does not hold good; for the self that is known, being a mental state, is different in character from the transcendent self which knows it. The transcendent self as such is the knower, while its reflection in the *buddhi* as coming back to it is the self that is known<sup>1</sup>. The objection that the admission of the possibility of self-knowledge stands against the doctrine of the self-luminosity of the self is not valid. The self-luminosity of the self simply means that it shines by itself and does not require the aid of any conditions to manifest itself.

### Self-Luminosity and Ignorance.

Citsukha has defined self-luminosity as that which not being knowable may yet be treated or felt as immediate (*avedyatve sati aparokṣa-vyavahāra-yogyatvam*). Bhikṣu argues that such a definition of self-luminosity (*svaprakāśatva*) is quite inadmissible. It is nowhere so defined in the Upaniṣads and it does not follow from the etymology of the word *svaprakāśatva*. The etymology only indicates the meaning "known by itself." Again, if a thing is not known or cognized, it cannot for that simple reason have any relation to us; and such a meaning would be directly against the scriptural testimony which affirms that the ultimate truth can be apprehended or intuited. It may be suggested that though the Brahma-state of the mind cannot be directly known yet it will have the effect of removing the *avidyā* in the *puruṣa*. But this is open to various objections. Firstly, the self-luminous is a valid means of knowledge—a *pramāṇa*; but the mere removal of the *avidyā* from

<sup>1</sup> *ātma'pi bimba-rūpeṇa jñātā bhavati svagata-sva-pratibimba-rūpeṇa ca jñeyah. Vijñāna-mṛta-bhāṣya*, I. 1. 3.

the *puruṣa* cannot be regarded as valid knowledge or a *pramāṇa*. In this connection it is also relevant to ask the meaning of the term "*avidyā*." If it means an illusory mental state, it must be a state of the *buddhi*, and its destruction must also belong to the *buddhi* and not to the *puruṣa*. If it means the psychical instincts or root-inclinations which are the cause of errors, then also since such root-instincts belong to the *guṇas* of the *prakṛti* the destruction of such root-instincts must also qualify the *prakṛti*. If it is regarded as a *tamas*—substance which covers the self, the supposition would be inadmissible, for if the *tamas* inherent in the *buddhi* is not removed there cannot be any modification of the *buddhi* copying the object in it, and if the *tamas* in the *buddhi* is once so removed then there cannot be any reflection of it in the *puruṣa*. Thus the view that knowledge leads to the dissolution of the veil of ignorance cannot be supported. The veil is only related to the instruments of knowledge, such as the eye, and cannot therefore be regarded as having anything to do with the pure consciousness. The explanation of the rise of knowledge as being due to the removal of the veil in the pure consciousness cannot therefore be justified. There cannot be any veil in the self. If the self be of the nature of pure consciousness, there cannot be any veil of ignorance inherent in it as the two suppositions are self-contradictory. Again, if it is supposed that the world-appearance is due to the operation of the principle of ignorance or *avidyā* in the mind and if it is supposed that true knowledge dispels such ignorance, then we are led to the absolutely unwarrantable conclusion that the world may be destroyed by knowledge, or that when one self attains true knowledge the world-appearance as such ceases, or that when emancipation is attained during the lifetime of a saint he will have no experience of the world around him. If it is held that the emancipated saint has still an element of ignorance in him, then the theory that knowledge destroys ignorance has to be given up. Moreover, if the self be regarded as being absolutely unattached to anything (*a-saṅga*), it is wrong to suppose that it would be associated with *avidyā* or ignorance. The veil can have reference only to the mental states, but it cannot have any relation to pure and unchangeable consciousness; for we have no analogy for such a thing. Again, if it is held that there is natural association of ignorance with pure consciousness, such an association can never be broken off. If such an

association be regarded as the consequence of some causal condition, it may well be said that such causality may be found in the mental states themselves. At least this would be a much simpler supposition than the primary assumption of a relationship of *avidyā* with pure consciousness and then to assume the operation of the mental states to dissolve it. The association of a veil with the mental states has to be admitted at least in the case of deep sleep, swoon or senility. Thus, if the veil has to be associated with the mental states, as the instrument of knowledge, it is quite unnecessary to assume it with reference to the self or pure consciousness. Patañjali, in his *Yoga-sūtra*, has defined *avidyā* as a mental state which apprehends the non-eternal as the eternal, the impure as the pure, the pleasure as sorrow. It is not, therefore, to be regarded as a separate substance inseparably associated with pure consciousness. In the same way it is wrong to define knowledge as the cessation of *avidyā*, which belongs to the *puruṣa* in this capacity. The proper way of representing it would be to say that knowledge arises in the *puruṣa* with the cessation of *avidyā* in the mental states. With the rise of the final knowledge as "I am Brahman" towards which the whole teleological movement of the *prakṛti* for the *puruṣa* was tending, the ultimate purpose of the *prakṛti* for the sake of the *puruṣa* is realized, and that being so the teleological bond which was uniting or associating the *buddhi* with the *puruṣa* is torn asunder and the mind or the *buddhi* ceases to have any function to discharge for the sake of the *puruṣa*. With the destruction of false knowledge all virtue and vice also cease and thus there is the final emancipation with the destruction of the integrity of the *buddhi*. *Avidyā* (false knowledge), *asmitā* (egoism), *rāga* (attachment), *dveṣa* (antipathy), *abhiniveśa* (self-love) may all be regarded as *avidyā* or false knowledge which is their cause, and *avidyā* may also be regarded as *tamas* which is its cause. This *tamas* obstructs the manifestation of *sattva* and it is for this reason that there is false knowledge. When the *tamas* is dominated by the *sattva*, the *sattva* manifests through its instrumentality the ultimate self. The words "knowledge" (*jñāna*) and "ignorance" (*ajñāna*) are used in the scriptures to denote *sattva* and *tamas*. The word *tamas* is used to denote *ajñāna* and there is no such *ajñāna* as indescribable or indefinite entity as is supposed by the Śāṅkarites. In ordinary experiential knowledge this *tamas* is only temporarily removed, but

in the case of the rise of true and ultimate knowledge the power of the *guṇas* to undergo modification for the sake of the relevant *puruṣa* is destroyed. Before the *sattva* can show itself in its own *vyrtti* or state, it must dominate the *tamas* which would have resisted the *sattva* state. Thus the ontological opposition of the *sattva* and the *tamas* must settle their differences before a psychological state can make its appearance.

### Relation of Sāṃkhya and Vedānta according to Bhikṣu.

Bhikṣu thinks that the Sāṃkhya and Yoga philosophies are intimately connected with the Vedānta and are referred to in the Upaniṣads. For this reason when certain topics, as for example the problem of experiential knowledge, are not described in the Vedānta, these are to be supplemented from the Sāṃkhya and Yoga. If there is any seeming antagonism between the two, these also have to be so explained that the opposition may be reconciled. Bhikṣu takes this attitude not only towards Sāṃkhya-yoga but also towards Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, and the *Pañcarātra*. According to him all these systems have their basis in the Vedas and the Upaniṣads and have therefore an internal affinity which is not to be found in the Buddhists. The Buddhists are therefore the only real opponents. Thus he attempts to reconcile all the *āstika* systems of philosophy as more or less supplementary to one another or at least presenting differences which can be reconciled if they are looked at from the proper angles of vision. Bhikṣu collects his materials from the Upaniṣads, the Purāṇas and the *smṛtis* and tries to build his system of interpretation on that basis. It may, therefore, be regarded on the whole as a faithful interpretation of the theistic Vedānta which is the dominant view of the Purāṇas in general and which represents the general Hindu view of life and religion. Compared with this general current of Hindu thought, which flows through the Purāṇas and the *smṛtis* and has been the main source from which the Hindu life has drawn its inspiration, the extreme Sāṃkhya, the extreme Vedānta of Śaṅkara, the extreme Nyāya, and the extreme dualism of Madhva may be regarded as metaphysical formalisms of conventional philosophy. Bhikṣu's philosophy is a type of *bhedā-bheda* which has shown itself in various forms in Bharṭṛ-prapañca,

Bhāskara, Rāmānuja, Nimbārka and others. The general viewpoint of this *bhedā-bheda* philosophy is that it believes in the reality of the universe as well as in its spirituality, the distinctness of the individual souls as well as in their being centres of the manifestation of God, moral freedom and responsibility as well as a spiritual determinism, a personal God as well as an impersonal reality, the ultimate spirit in which matter and pre-matter are dissolved into spirituality, an immanent teleology pervading through matter and souls both in their origin and mutual intercourse as well as in the holiness of the divine will, omnipotence and omniscience, in the superior value of knowledge as well as of love, in the compulsoriness of moral and social duties as well as in their abnegation

The ordinary classical Sāṃkhya is well known to be atheistic and the problem arises as to how this may be reconciled with theism and the doctrine of incarnations. In interpreting *sūtra* 1. 1. 5, of the *Brahma-sūtra*, Bhikṣu says that since the scriptures say that "it perceived or desired," Brahman must be a Person, for desire or perception cannot be attributed to the inanimate pre-matter (*prakṛti*). Śaṅkara, in interpreting this *sūtra*, asserts that the purport of the *sūtra* is that *prakṛti* is not the cause of the world because the idea of a *prakṛti* or *pradhāna* is unvedic. Bhikṣu quotes a number of passages from the Upaniṣads to show that the idea of a *prakṛti* is not unvedic. *Prakṛti* is spoken of in the Upaniṣads as the cause of the world and as the energy of God. *Prakṛti* is also spoken of as *māyā* in the *Śvetāśvatara*, and God is spoken of as *māyāvi* or the magician who holds within Himself the magic power. The magician may withhold his magic, but the magic power lies all the same in him (*māyāyā vyāpāra-nivṛttir evā'vagamyate na nāśaḥ*)<sup>1</sup>. The ordinary *prakṛti* is always undergoing change and transformation and it is only the special *sattva*-stuff associated with God that is always regarded as unchanging.

A question that may naturally arise in this connection is, if God is Himself unchangeable and if the *sattva*-body with which He is always associated is also always unchangeable, how is it that God can have a desire to produce the world at any particular time? The only explanation of this is that the attribution of will to God at a particular creative moment is only a loose usage of language. It

<sup>1</sup> *Vijñāna-mṛta-bhāṣya*, 1. 1. 5.

means only that when the proper collocation of the causal conditions is ready for emergence into creative production at any particular point of time, it is designated as the manifestation of the creative will of God. God's knowledge and will cannot have a beginning in time<sup>1</sup>. But if God's creative will be regarded as the cause of the movement of the *prakṛti*, then the Sāṃkhya view that the movement of the *prakṛti* is solely due to its inherent teleology to be of service to the *puruṣas* becomes indefensible. The *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas* in the *mahat* are indeed regarded in Sāṃkhya as the triad of three persons, Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Maheśvara—the three created gods as it were (*janīye-śvara*). But the Sāṃkhya does not believe in any eternal God (*nitye-śvara*). According to Yoga the *sattva* part of *mahat* associated with eternal powers and existing eternally in the emancipated state is the person called *Īśvara*. His *sattva* body is, however, of the nature of an effect as it is derived from the *sattva* part of *mahat* and His knowledge is also not timeless.

In justification of Sāṃkhya, Bhikṣu maintains that the denial of God by the Sāṃkhya may be interpreted to mean that there is no necessity of admitting God for salvation. Salvation may be achieved by self-knowledge also. If this process is to be adopted, then it becomes quite unnecessary to prove the existence of God. It may, however, be remarked in this connection that this explanation of Bhikṣu can hardly be regarded as correct, for the *Sāṃkhya-sūtra* is not merely silent about God, but it makes a positive effort to prove the non-existence of God, and there is not one redeeming statement that can be interpreted to mean that Sāṃkhya was not antagonistic to theism. Bhikṣu, however, further reiterates that Sāṃkhya was not atheistic and refers to the statement in the *Śvetāśvatara* (vi. 16) that salvation can be obtained by knowing the ultimate cause as declared in the Sāṃkhya-yoga and to the statement of the *Gītā* where atheism is regarded as a demonic view.

In referring to Yoga, Bhikṣu says that it is curious that though the Yoga admitted the existence of God yet it did not make any effort to repudiate the idea that He might be partial or cruel; and instead of giving God His true cosmological place accepted a naturalistic view that *prakṛti* of itself passes through the transformatory changes, being determined by its own inherent teleology in relation to the *puruṣas*. *Īśvara*, in Patañjali's *Yoga-sūtra*, is an

<sup>1</sup> *Vijñāna-mṛta-bhāṣya*, I. 1. 5.

object of Yoga meditation and He shows His mercy to his devotees and other beings. Bhikṣu, however, thinks that unless God is made to serve a cosmological purpose the association of *prakṛti* with the *puruṣas* cannot be explained.

The *Īvara* is not conditioned in His activities by any entities which are associated with *rajas* or *tamas* which are of a fluctuating nature but with an entity which is always the same and which is always associated with eternal knowledge, will and bliss<sup>1</sup>. The natural implication of this is that the will of God behaves like an eternal and unchangeable law. This law, however, is not a constituent of God but a constituent of *prakṛti* itself. It is through this part, an eternal unchangeable law which behaves as the eternal will and knowledge of God, that the phenomenal or the changeable part of *prakṛti* is determined.

In the *Gītā* Śrī Kṛṣṇa says that He is the highest *puruṣa* and that there is nothing higher than Him. Bhikṣu gives two explanations of such statements which seem to be in opposition to the concept of God explained above. One explanation is that the reference of Kṛṣṇa as God to Himself is only a relative statement, made in a popular manner which has no reference to the nature of absolute God who is unrelationable to ordinary experience. The other explanation is that Kṛṣṇa calls Himself God by feeling Himself as identified with God. There is thus a distinction between *para-brahma* and *kārya-brahma*; and Śrī Kṛṣṇa, being the *kārya-brahman*, popularly describes Himself as the *kāraṇa-brahma*. When other beings identify themselves with *brahma*, such identification is true only with reference to *kārya-brahma*, Śrī Kṛṣṇa or Nārāyaṇa. They therefore have no right to speak of themselves as the absolute God. Beginningless absolute Brahman is unknown and unknowable, even by the gods and the sages. It is only the Nārāyaṇa who can know Him in His absolute nature. Nārāyaṇa is therefore to be regarded as the wisest of all beings<sup>2</sup>. Those beings who in the previous creation became one with God by *sāyujya-mukti* exist in the *Vāsudeva-vyūha*. In the *Vāsudeva-vyūha* Vāsudeva alone is the

<sup>1</sup> *rajas-tamah-sambhinnaṭayā malinaṃ kārya-tattvaṃ parame-īvarasya no' pādhiḥ kintu kevalaṃ nitya-jñāne-cchā-nandā-dīmat-sadai-ka-rūpaṃ kāraṇa-sattvaṃ eva tasyo' pādhiḥ. Īvara-gītā. MS.*

<sup>2</sup> *anādyam taṃ paraṃ brahma na devā*

*naṣṭayo viduḥ*

*ekas tad veda bhagavān dhātā nārāyaṇaḥ*

*prabhuḥ. Viññāna-mṛta-bhāṣya, I. 1. 5.*

eternal God; the other beings are but His parts. The other *vyūhas*, such as the Saṃkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha, are but the manifestations of Vāsudeva (*vibhūti*) and they are to be regarded as partial creation of God or as Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Rudra. The power of the lesser gods, Viṣṇu or Śiva, is limited, since they cannot produce any change in the regulation of the cosmic affairs. When they speak of themselves as the Supreme God they do so only by a process of self-identification with the absolute God. The mahattatva, with its threefold aspect as *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*, forms the subtle body of Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva or Saṃkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha. These three gods, therefore, are supposed to have the one body, the "*mahat*," which forms the basic foundation and substratum of all cosmic evolution. It is for this reason that they are said to have the cosmos or the universe as their body. These three deities are regarded as mutually interdependent in their operations, like *vāta*, *pitta* and *kapha*. It is for this reason that they are said to be both different from one another and yet identical<sup>1</sup>. These three deities are identical with "*mahat*" which again is the unity of *puruṣa* and *prakṛti*. It is for this reason that Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Maheśvara are to be regarded as the partial manifestations (*aṃśāvatam*) of Gods and not direct incarnations<sup>2</sup>.

The penetration of *Īśvara* into *pradhāna* and *puruṣa* is through His knowledge, will and effort by which He rouses the *guṇas* and helps the production of the *mahat*. Bhikṣu takes great pains to show that Bhagavān or absolute God is different from Nārāyaṇa or Viṣṇu who are direct manifestations of Him just as sons are of the father. Bhikṣu here differs from the opinion of the *Pañcarātra* school and of other thinkers such as Madhva, Vallabha and Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas who regard Nārāyaṇa, Viṣṇu and Kṛṣṇa as identical with God. The other *avatāras*, such as the Matsya, Kūrma, etc., are regarded by Bhikṣu as the *līlā-vatāra* of Viṣṇu and the *āveśā-vatāra* of God as *bhagavān* or *parameśvara*.

<sup>1</sup> *Vijñānā-mṛta-bhāṣya*, 1. 1. 5.

<sup>2</sup> In this connection Bhikṣu quotes the famous verse of the *Bhāgavata*, *ete cā mīa-kaldh pumsaḥ kṛṣṇas tu bhagavān svayam*. 1. 1. 5. He, however, paraphrases Kṛṣṇa as Viṣṇu and explains *svayam bhagavān* as being the part of God just as the son is the part of the father: *atra kṛṣṇo viṣṇuḥ svayam parameśvaras tasya putravat sākṣād aṃśa ity arthaḥ*. *Ibid*. This, however, goes directly against the interpretation of the verse by the Gauḍīya school of Vaiṣṇavas who regard Kṛṣṇa as being the absolute God.

### Māyā and Pradhāna.

Śaṅkara, in his commentary on the *Vedānta-sūtra*, 1. 1. 4, discusses the meaning of the term *avyakta* and holds that it has no technical meaning but is merely a negation of *vyakta* or manifested form. He says that the word *avyakta* is compounded of the negative particle *na* and *vyakta*. He points out that since the term *avyakta* has thus a mere etymological meaning and signifies merely the unmanifested, it cannot be regarded as having a technical application to the *Pradhāna* of Sāṃkhya. The *avyakta* according to Śaṅkara thus means the subtle cause, but he does not think that there is an independent subtle cause of the world corresponding to the *Pradhāna* of the Sāṃkhya<sup>1</sup>. He holds that this primal state of the existence of the universe is dependent upon God and is not an independent reality. Without the acceptance of such a subtle power abiding in God, God cannot be a creator. For without power God cannot move Himself towards creation; it is the seed power called *avidyā* which is denoted by the term *avyakta*. It is the great sleep of *māyā* (*māyāmayī mahā-supti*) depending upon God. In it all the *jīvas* lie without any self-awakening. The potency of the seed power is destroyed by knowledge in the case of emancipated beings and for that reason they are not born again<sup>2</sup>. Vācaspati, in commenting on it in his *Bhāmātī*, says that there are different *avidyās* with reference to different selves. Whenever an individual attempts to gain wisdom, the *avidyā* associated with him is destroyed, though the *avidyā* associated with other individuals remains the same. Thus, even though one *avidyā* is destroyed, the other *avidyās* may remain in an operative condition and may produce the world. In the case of the Sāṃkhyaists, however, who admit one *pradhāna*, its destruction would mean the destruction of all. Vācaspati says further that if it is held that though the *pradhāna* remains the same yet the *avidyā* as non-distinction between *puruṣa* and the *buddhi* is responsible for bondage, then there is no necessity of admitting the *prakṛti* at all. The existence and the non-existence of *avidyā* would explain the problem of bondage and emancipation.

<sup>1</sup> *yadi vayaṃ sva-tantraṃ kāñcit prāg-avasthām jagataḥ kāraṇatvena' bhyupagacchema praśaṅjayema tadā pradhāna-kāraṇa-vādam. Vedānta-sūtra*, 1. 4. 3.

<sup>2</sup> *muktānāṃ ca punar an utpattiḥ; kutaḥ vidyayā tasyā vija-śakter dāhāt. Ibid.*

The objection that the distinction of selves depends upon *avidyā* and the distinction of *avidyā* upon the distinction of the selves is invalid, for the process is beginningless. The term *avyakta* refers to *avidyā* in a generic sense as including all *avidyās*. The *avidyā* rests in the individual but is yet dependent upon God as its agent and object. The *avidyā* cannot come into operation without having the Brahman as its support, though the real nature of the selves is Brahman; yet, so long as they are surrounded by *avidyā*, they cannot know their real nature.

In reply Bhikṣu says that since without power God alone is unable to create the manifold universe it has to be admitted that God does so by a power distinct from Him, and this power is the *prakṛti* and the *puruṣa*. If it is said that this power is *avidyā*, then also since it is a dual factor separate from Brahman that may as much nullify the monistic doctrine as the admission of *prakṛti* and *puruṣa*. It cannot also be said that in the time of *pralaya* the *avidyā* is non-existent, for in that case there being only Brahman the world would have to be admitted as coming into being from Brahman alone, and the selves that lie identified with Brahman and one with Him would, even though emancipated, undergo the world-process (*samsāra*). If it is held that bondage and emancipation are all imaginary, then there is no reason why people should undergo so much trouble in order to attain an imaginary emancipation. If it is held that *avidyā* may be said to have a secondary or *vyavahārika* existence at the time of *pralaya*, and if it is argued that under the circumstances bondage and emancipation may also be regarded as having a merely secondary existence, the view of monism would be unexceptional. But if such an *avidyā* be admitted which has mere *vyavahārika* or secondary existence, the same may be supposed with regard to *pradhāna*. If we inquire into the meaning and significance of the term *vyavahārika*, we find that its connotation is limited to the power of effectuation and service towards the fulfilment of the purpose. If that is so, then *prakṛti* may also be admitted to have a similar kind of existence<sup>1</sup>. It is true no doubt that the *pradhāna* is regarded as eternal, but this eternality is an eternality of ceaseless change. *Avidyā* is regarded by the Vedāntists as *apāramārthikā*, that is, *avidyā* is not true

<sup>1</sup> *pradhāne* 'pīdaṃ tulyaṃ pradhāne artha-kriyā-kāritva-rūpa-vyavahārika-sattvayai'vā'smākaṃ iṣṭatvāt. *Vijñāna-mṛta-bhāṣya*, i. 4. 3.

absolutely. This negation of absolute truth may mean that it is not immediate and self-apparent or that it cannot manifest itself as being or that it has no existence in all times. But such limitations are true also of *pradhāna*. The *pradhāna* is eternal as changeful, but it is non-eternal in all its products. All the products of *prakṛti* are destructible; being unintelligent by nature they can never be self-apparent. Again, though *pradhāna* may be said to be existent in any particular form at any particular time, yet even at that time it is non-existent in all its past and future forms. Thus, since *vyavahārikatva* cannot mean absolute non-existence (like the hare's horn) and since it cannot also mean absolute existence it can only mean changefulness (*pariṇāmittva*); and such an existence is true of the *pradhāna*. Thus Śāṅkarites do not gain anything in criticizing the doctrine of *pradhāna*, as a substitute of the *avidyā* is supposed by them to be endowed with the same characteristics as those of the *prakṛti*.

It is thus evident that Śāṅkara's criticism against *prakṛti* may well apply to the *prakṛti* of Īśvara Kṛṣṇa, but it has hardly any application to the doctrine of *prakṛti* as conceived in the Purāṇas as interpreted by Bhikṣu, where *prakṛti* is regarded as a power of Brahman. If *avidyā* is also so regarded, it becomes similar to *prakṛti*. As it is believed to be existent in a potential form in God, even in the *pralaya*, most of the connotations of *avidyā* that distinguish it from the absolute reality in the Brahman are also the connotations of *prakṛti*.

According to the view propounded by Bhikṣu *pradhāna* is not regarded as having a separate and independent existence but only as a power of God<sup>1</sup>.

In explaining *Brahma-sūtra* 1. 4. 23, Bhikṣu points out that *Īśvara* has no other *upādhi* than *prakṛti*. All the qualities of *Īśvara* such as bliss, etc., proceed from *prakṛti* as is shown in *Patañjali-sūtra*. *Prakṛti* is to be regarded as the characteristic nature of Brahman, which is not directly the material cause of the world, but is only the abiding or the ground cause (*adhiṣṭhāna-kāraṇa*), and *prakṛti*, as it were, is its own character or part (*svīyo bhāvaḥ padārtha upādhir ity arthaḥ*). The relation between this *upādhi* and *prakṛti* is one of the controller and the controlled or the possessor

<sup>1</sup> *Prakṛ tasya tad-upapattaye pradhānaṃ kāraṇatva-śarīravac chaktividhayaś'-vo'cyate na svāntaryeṇa' ty a vadhāryata ity arthaḥ. Vijñāna-mṛta-bhāṣya, 1. 4. 4.*

and the possessed. The fact that God can think or will also testifies to the fact that God must have as His instrument the *prakṛti* which can make such thinking possible for Him. For God is in Himself only pure consciousness. *Prakṛti*, however, behaves as the *upādhi* of God with its purer parts of the eternally pure *sattva*. *Kāla* and *adr̥ṣṭa* also form part of the *prakṛti* and as such are not regarded as the separate powers of God.

### Bhikṣu's criticism of the Sāṃkhya and Yoga.

In commenting on the *Brahma-sūtra*, II. 1. 1, 2, 3, Bhikṣu says that Manu speaks of the original cause as being the *prakṛti*, and so also does the Sāṃkhya, and both of them are regarded as authoritative<sup>1</sup>. But since the Sāṃkhya doctrine of atheism is contradicted by the opinions of Patañjali and Parāśara, the view of the *Brahma-sūtras* cannot be interpreted merely on the atheistic suggestion of Sāṃkhya. It has also to be admitted that the atheistic portion of Sāṃkhya has no authoritative support either in the Vedas or in the Purāṇas and has therefore to be regarded as invalid<sup>2</sup>.

It is wrong, however, to suppose that Kapila really intended to preach atheism. He quoted atheistic arguments from others and showed that even if God were not accepted emancipation could be obtained by differentiation of *prakṛti* from *puruṣa*. The Sāṃkhya also emphasizes the fact that emancipation can be obtained merely by knowledge. This, however, should not be interpreted as being in conflict with the Upaniṣadic texts which declare that emancipation can be obtained only by the true knowledge of God. For these signify only that there are two ways of obtaining emancipation, the inferior one being through knowledge of the distinction of *prakṛti* and *puruṣa*, and the superior one through the true knowledge of God. The Yoga also shows two ways of emancipation, the inferior one being through the ordinary Yoga processes, and the superior one through the renunciation to God of all actions and through devotion to Him. It is also wrong to suppose that the Sāṃkhya is traditionally atheistic, for in the *Mahābhārata* (*Śānti-parvan* 318. 73) and *Matsya Purāṇa* (4. 28) we hear of a twenty-sixth category,

<sup>1</sup> *sāṃkhyam yogam pañca-rātram vedāḥ pāśupatam tathā* 1. *paras-parāny aṅgāny etāni hetubhir na virodhayet. Vijñāna-mṛta-bhāṣya*, II. 1. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *itāś ce'svara-pratiṣedhā-mśe kapila-smṛteḥ mūlānām anupalabdheḥ a-pratyakṣatvāt durvalatvam ity āha. Ibid.*

the God. So the difference between the theistic and the atheistic Sāṃkhya is due to the difference of representation as the true Sāṃkhya doctrine and the Sāṃkhya doctrine which proposes to ensure emancipation even for those who are not willing to believe in God. In this connection Bhikṣu admits the probability of two different schools of Sāṃkhya, one admitting *Īśvara* and the other not admitting it, and it is only the latter which he thinks to be invalid<sup>1</sup>. He also refers to the *Kūrma Purāṇa* in which the Sāṃkhyists and the Yogins are said to be atheistic. The chief defect of the Śāṅkara school is that instead of pointing out the invalidity of theistic Sāṃkhya, Śāṅkara denies all theistic speculations as non-vedic and misinterprets the *Brahma-sūtras* accordingly. Bhikṣu refers to *Prasna*, 4. 8, where the twenty-three categories of Sāṃkhya are mentioned and only *prakṛti* has been omitted. The *mahat-tattva* is not mentioned directly, but only as *buddhi* and *citta*. The fourfold division of the *buddhi-tattva* as *manas*, *buddhi ahaṃkāra* and *citta* is also admitted there. In the *Garbha Upaniṣad* eight *prakṛtis* and sixteen *vikāras* are mentioned. In the *Maitreya-upaniṣad* we hear of the three *guṇas* and their disturbance by which creation takes place. We hear also that the *puruṣas* are pure consciousness. In *Maitrī Upaniṣad*, v. 2, it is said that the *tamas*, being disturbed by the supreme being, gives rise to *rajas* and that to *sattva*<sup>2</sup>. In the *Cūlikā Upaniṣad* the categories of the Sāṃkhya doctrine are also mentioned in consonance with the monistic doctrine of the Vedānta. It also says that there are various schools of the Sāṃkhya, that there are some who admit twenty-six categories, others twenty-seven, and again others who admit only twenty-four categories. There is also said to be a monistic and also a dualistic Sāṃkhya and that they find expression in three or five different ways. Thus Vijñāna Bhikṣu says that the Sāṃkhya doctrine is definitely supported by the Upaniṣadic texts.

Concerning the Yoga also it can be said that only that part of it may be regarded as opposed by the Upaniṣads which holds a separate and independent existence of *prakṛti* as apart from *Īśvara*. In the *Sūtras* of Patañjali it is said that God helps the movement of the *prakṛti* only by removing the obstacles, just as a ploughman enables

<sup>1</sup> *athavā kapilai-ka-deśasya prāmāṇyam astu. Vijñāna-mṛta-bhāṣya*, II. 1. 2.

<sup>2</sup> *tamo vā idm ekamagre āstī vai rajasas tat pare syāt tat pareṇ'ritaṃ viṣamatvaṃ prayāty etad rūpaṃ tad rajaḥ khalu ī-ritaṃ viṣamatvaṃ prayāty etad vai sattvasya rūpaṃ tat sattvaṃ eva. Maitrī Upaniṣad*, v. 2.

water to pass from one field to another. But the Upaniṣads definitely say that God is the generator of the movement and the disturbance of the *prakṛti*. The *sattva* body of God is thus there held to be a product of *prakṛti* as it comes into being from the *prakṛti* through desire in a previous creative cycle. The *sattva* body of God is thus derived from the *prakṛti*, through the will of God serving as the vehicle of the will of God for the removal of the obstructions in the course of the evolutionary process of the *prakṛti*. *Prakṛti* in itself therefore is not regarded by Patañjali as the *upādhi* of *Īśvara*<sup>1</sup>. Bhikṣu seeks to explain this part of the Yoga doctrine also in the same manner as he did with the Sāṃkhya by accepting the so-called *abhyūpagama-vāda*. He maintains that the Yoga holds that even if it is considered that the *prakṛti* is independent and runs into evolutionary activity by herself, undetermined by the eternal knowledge and will of God, and even if it be admitted that the eternal God has no eternal knowledge and will and that the movement of *prakṛti* is due to an inner teleology in accordance with *karma*, and that in the beginning of the creation *prakṛti* is transformed into the *sattvo'pādhi* of God, even then by self-abnegation to God *kaivalya* can be attained. Thus, in the Yoga view the *upādhi* of *Īśvara* is a product and not the material or the instrumental cause of the world, whereas in the Vedānta view as propounded by Bhikṣu the *upādhi* of *Īśvara* is both the material and the instrumental cause of the world, and this *upādhi* which forms the material stuff of the world is *prakṛti* herself and not her product. In the Yoga view God is eternal, but His thought and will are not eternal. This thought and will are associated with the *sattva* part of *prakṛti* which lies embedded in it at the time of *pralaya* which only shows itself at the beginning of a new creative cycle through the potency left in it by the will of God in the previous creative cycle. God, in the view of Yoga, is thus not both the material and the instrumental cause of the world as the Vedānta holds. According to the Vedānta as explained by Bhikṣu, the *prakṛti* plays her dual part; in one part she remains as the eternal vehicle of the eternal knowledge and will of God, and through the other part she runs through an evolutionary process by producing disturbances of *sattva*, *rajas* and

<sup>1</sup> *yogā hīśvarasya jagan-nimittatvaṃ prakṛtītenābhyūpagacchanti Īśvaro-pādheḥ sattva-viśeṣasya purva-sargīya-tat-saṃkalpa-vasāt sargā-dau sva-tantra-prakṛtīta utpady-angīkārāt. Vijñānā-mṛta-bhāṣya*, II. 1. 2.

*tamas*. This also explains the Purāṇic view of the gradual derivation of *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas* as stages in the evolution of *prakṛti* through which at a later stage the cosmic evolution takes place. Thus the *prakṛti* which remains associated with God as the vehicle of His knowledge and will is unchangeable and eternal<sup>1</sup>.

### *Īśvara-gītā*, its Philosophy as expounded by Vijñāna Bhikṣu.

In the second part (*uttara-vibhāga*) of the *Kūrma Purāṇa* the first eleven chapters are called *Īśvara-gītā*. In the first chapter of this section Suta asks Vyāsa about the true knowledge leading to emancipation as originally instructed by Nārāyaṇa in his incarnation as a tortoise. It is reported by Vyāsa that in Vadarikāśrama in an assembly of the sages Sanat-kumāra, Sanandana, Sanaka, Aṅgirā, Bhṛgu, Kaṇāda, Kapila, Garga, Valadeva, Śukra, and Vasiṣṭha Ṛṣi Nārāyaṇa appeared and later on Śiva also came there. Śiva then at the request of the sages gave a discourse regarding the ultimate nature of reality, the world and God. The real discourse begins with the second chapter. Vijñāna Bhikṣu wrote a commentary on the *Īśvara-gītā*; he thought that since the *Īśvara-gītā* contains the main purport of the *Bhagavad-gītā* it was unnecessary for him to write any commentary on the latter. Apart from the *Sāṃkhya* and *Yoga* works, Vijñāna Bhikṣu wrote a commentary on the *Brahma-sūtra*, a commentary on the Upaniṣads, and a commentary on the *Īśvara-gītā* of the *Kūrma Purāṇa*. In his commentary on the *Brahma-sūtra* he quotes a passage from Citsukhācārya of the thirteenth century. He himself probably flourished some time in the fourteenth century. Bhikṣu's other works are *Sāṃkhya-pravacana-bhāṣya*, *Yoga-vārtika*, *Yoga-sūtra*, *Sāṃkhya-sāra*, and the *Upadeśa-ratnamālā*. In his interpretation of the *Brahma-sūtra* and of the *Īśvara-gītā* he has followed the line of interpretation of Vedānta as adopted in the Purāṇas, where the *Sāṃkhya-yoga* and Vedānta appear to be welded together into one indivisible harmonious system. The philosophy of the *Īśvara-gītā* as dealt with here is based upon Bhikṣu's commentary, called the *Īśvara-gītā-bhāṣya* which was available to the present writer as a manuscript by courtesy of M. M. Gopinātha Kavirāja, of the Benares Sanskrit College.

<sup>1</sup> *Vijñāna-mṛta-bhāṣya*, pp. 271, 272.

The main questions that were asked by the sages which led to the discourse of Śiva are the following: (1) What is the cause of all? (2) Who suffers rebirth? (3) What is the soul? (4) What is emancipation? (5) What is the cause of rebirth? (6) What is the nature of rebirth? (7) Who can realize all? (8) What is the ultimate reality, the Brahman? The answers to these questions are not given serially, but the most important topics as they appeared to the instructor, Śiva, were handled by him in his own order of discourse. Thus the eighth question was taken up for answer before all other questions. This answer begins with a description of the nature of *Ātman* not as the individual soul, but as the highest self.

Vijñāna Bhikṣu seems to acknowledge the doctrine of absolute absorption or assimilation of the individual soul within the universal and infinite soul. And even during his existence in this world, the soul is said to be merely a witness.

He explains that in the answer to the eighth question in the *Kūrma Purāṇa*, II. l. 7, p. 453<sup>1</sup>, the word *ātmā* refers to the God-head, though in ordinary usage it stands only for the finite souls, and suggests the self-sameness of the finite and infinite souls. The reference here is thus to the *prākṛtā-tmā* and not to the *jīvā-tmā*<sup>2</sup>. God is called *sarvā-ntara* as He has already entered the hearts (*antaḥ*) of the diverse living beings and exists there in the capacity of being only a witness (*sarveṣāṃ sva-bhinnānām antaḥ-sākṣitvena' nugataḥ*)<sup>3</sup>. A *sākṣī* (witness) is he who illuminates (*sva-pratīvimbita-vastu-bhāsakaḥ*), without any efforts on his part (*vyāpāram vinaī' va*). He is called *antaryāmi* on account of his association with finite intelligences and through this association even the individual soul shares the greatness of the highest self.

Vijñāna Bhikṣu says that the line "*asmād vijāyate viśvam atraī' va pravilīyate*" occurs here by way of giving a reason for the *śakti-śaktimad-a-bhedatva* doctrine so ably put forth by calling the ultimate Reality or *paramā-tman*, *antaryāmin* and then explaining the doctrine a little by giving him a few adjectives more to bring out the significance of the esoteric doctrine or suggestion of *śakti-śaktimad-abhedatva*. Now it is said that as it is from Him that the inverse-effects are created, in Him they exist and in Him they are

<sup>1</sup> *Bibliotheca Indica* edition, 1890.

<sup>2</sup> See *Īśvara-gītā-bhāṣya*, MS.

<sup>3</sup> *evam antaryāmi-sattva-sambandhāt cin mātro'pi paramā-ntaryāmi bhavati sarvā-ntaratvena sarva-śaktiṣu' avibhāga-lakṣaṇā-bhedāt. Ibid.*

annihilated. He is non-different (or better, inseparable) from *puruṣa* and *prakṛti*, because of His being the support and the ground of the whole universe beginning from *puruṣa* and *prakṛti*; i.e. of the effects right down from *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* and inclusive of them. If like the body He had not superintended all the causal agencies, then the cause, like the *dravya*, *guṇa*, *karma*, etc., could not have effected any causal function (*yadi hi paramā-tmā dehavat sarvaṃ kāraṇaṃ nā'dhitiṣṭheta tarhi dravya-guṇa-karmā-di-sādhāraṇa-khila-kriyā-rtha-mūla-kāraṇaṃ na syād iti*)<sup>1</sup>. If it is said that the sentence speaks of effectedness (or causality) as common to all tangible manifestations, then the idea of the previous sentence maintaining the identity between Brahman and the world would not be admissible<sup>2</sup>.

Brahman is the *upādāna-kāraṇa* of the universe, but this universe is a *pariṇāmi-rūpa* of Brahman. His is not therefore the *pariṇāmi-rūpa*, because that will contradict the statements made by the scriptures declaring the Brahman to be unchangeable (*kūṭastha*). Then Vijñāna Bhikṣu defines that God being the ultimate substratum of all, the functioning of all types of causes is helped in its operation by Him and it is this that is called the *adhiṣṭhāna-kāraṇatā* of God.

Then he maintains his doctrine of *jīvātma-paramā-tmanor aṃśāmsy-abheda* by the line "*sa māyī māyayā baddhaḥ karoti vividhās tanūḥ*" and says further that *Yājñavalkya-smṛti* and *Vedānta-sūtra* also preach the same doctrine. *Śrīmad-bhagavad-gītā* says the same thing. Then comes the elaboration of the same idea. A reference to Śaṅkara by way of criticizing him is made<sup>3</sup>. *Māyā-vāda* is called a sort of covert Buddhism and for support a passage from *Padma-purāṇa* has also been quoted.

*Adhiṣṭhāna-kāraṇatva*, or the underlying causality, is defined as that in which, essence remaining the same, new differences emerge just as a spark from the fire. This is also called the *aṃśāmsi-bhāva*, for, though the *niravayava* Brahman cannot be regarded as having parts, yet it is on account of the emergence of different characters from a common basis that the characterized units are called the parts of the common basis. It should be noted that Vijñāna Bhikṣu is against the view that the Brahman undergoes any transformatory

<sup>1</sup> *Īvara-gītā-bhāṣya*. MS.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

change. Though the Brahman does not undergo any transformatory change, yet new differences emerge out of it. In the sentence "*Sa māyī māyayā baddhaḥ*" the idea is that the *māyā* itself is an integral part of the Divine entity and not different from it. The *māyā* is like an *aṃśa* which is identical with the *aṃśin*.

Though in the scriptures both the distinction and the identity of the individual with the Brahman have often been mentioned, yet it is by the realization of the difference of the individual with the Brahman that ultimate emancipation can be attained<sup>1</sup>.

The self is of the nature of pure consciousness and is not in any way bound by its experiences. The assertion of Śaṅkara that *ātmā* is of the nature of joy or bliss is also wrong; for no one can always be attached to himself, and the fact that everyone seeks to further his own interest in all his actions does not imply that the soul is of the nature of bliss. Moreover, if the soul is of the nature of pure consciousness, it cannot at the same time be of the nature of pure bliss; at the time of acquiring knowledge we do not always feel pleasure.<sup>2</sup>

Egoism (*abhimāna*) also does not belong to the soul but like *sukha* and *duḥkha* belongs to *prakṛti*, which are wrongly attributed to the self.<sup>3</sup> The soul is, however, regarded as an enjoyer of its experiences of pleasure and pain, a reflection of them on it through the *vyṛtti*, and such a reflection of pleasure and pain, etc., through the *vyṛtti* is regarded as the realization (*sākṣātkāra*) of the experiences. Such an enjoyment of experiences, therefore, is to be regarded as *anaupādhika* (or unconditional). This is also borne out by the testimony of the *Bhagavad-gītā* and Sāṃkhya. Such an enjoyment of the experiences does not belong to the *prakṛti* (*sākṣātkāra-rūpa-dharmasya dr̥śya-dharmatva-sambhavāt*)<sup>4</sup>. The passages which say that the experiences do not belong to the *puruṣa* refer to the modifications of *vyṛtti* in connection with the experiences. The assertion of Śaṅkara, therefore, that the *ātman* is as incapable of experiences (*bhoga*) as of the power of acting (*kartṛtva*) is therefore false.

*Ajñāna*, according to Vijñāna Bhikṣu, means *anyathā-jñāna*. *Pradhāna* is so called because it performs all the actions for the sake of the *puruṣa*; and it is through the fault of his association with *pradhāna* that the *puruṣa* is associated with false knowledge.

<sup>1</sup> *Īśvara-gītā-bhāṣya*.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

The *ātman* remains unchanged in itself and the differences are due to the emergence of the association of *buddhi* and other faculties which give rise to experience. At the time of emancipation *jīvas* remain undifferentiated with Brahman. *Prakṛti*, *puṛuṣa*, and *kāla* are ultimately supported in Brahman and yet are different from it.

There are indeed two kinds of scriptural texts, one emphasizing the monistic side, the other the dualistic. A right interpretation should, however, emphasize the duality-texts, for if everything were false then even such a falsity would be undemonstrable and self-contradictory. If it is argued that one may accept the validity of the scriptural texts until the Brahman is realized and when that is done it matters little if the scriptural texts are found invalid, the reply to such an objection is that, whenever a person discovers that the means through which he attained the conclusion was invalid, he naturally suspects the very conclusion arrived at. Thus the knowledge of Brahman would itself appear doubtful to a person who discovers that the instruments of such knowledge were themselves defective.

The individual soul exists in the *paramā-tman* in an undifferentiated state in the sense that the *paramā-tman* is the essence or ground-cause of the *jīvas*; and the texts which emphasize the monistic side indicate this nature of *paramā-tman* as the ground-cause. This does not imply that the individual souls are identical with Brahman.

Pleasure and pain do not belong to the self; they really belong to the *antaḥkaraṇa* and they are ascribed to the self only through the association of the *antaḥkaraṇa* with the self. In the state of emancipation the self is pure consciousness without any association of pleasure and pain. The ultimate end is the cessation of the suffering of sorrow (*duḥkha-bhoga-nivṛtti*) and not the cessation of sorrow (*na duḥkha-nivṛttiḥ*); for when one has ceased to suffer sorrow, sorrow may still be there and the avoidance of it would be the end of other persons. The assertion of Śaṅkara that there is bliss in the stage of emancipation is wrong. For during that stage there is no mental organ by which happiness could be enjoyed. If the self be regarded as of the nature of bliss, then also the self would be both the agent and the object of the enjoyment of bliss, which is impossible. The ascription of *ānanda* in the state of emancipation only refers to it in a technical sense, i.e., *ānanda* means the absence of pleasure and pain.

Bhikṣu admits a gradation of realities. He holds further that when one entity is stabler than another, the former is more real than the latter. Since *paramā-tman* is always the same and does not undergo any change or transformation or dissolution, He is more real than the *prakṛti* or *puruṣa* or the evolutes of *prakṛti*. This idea has also been expressed in the view of the Purāṇas that the ultimate essence of the world is of the nature of knowledge which is the form of the *paramā-tman*. It is in this essential form that the world is regarded as ultimately real and not as *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* which are changing forms.

The *prakṛti* or *māyā* has often been described as that which can be called neither existent nor non-existent. This has been interpreted by the Śāṅkarites as implying the falsity of *māyā*. But according to Vijñāna Bhikṣu it means that the original cause may be regarded as partly real and partly unreal in the sense that while it is unproductive it is regarded as unreal, and when it passes through the course of evolutionary changes it is regarded as real (*kiñcīt sad-rūpā kiñcīt asad-rūpā ca bhavati*).

Now coming to *sādhana* he says that by *āgama*, *anumāna* and *dhyāna* one should attain self-knowledge. This self-realization leads to the *asamprajñāta-yoga* which uproots all the *vāsanās*. It is attained not only by the cessation of *ajñāna* but also by the destruction of the *karmas*. He also maintains that the emphasis of Śāṅkara on the understanding of the Upaniṣadic texts as a means to the attainment of self-realization is also wrong.

In the state of *mukti*, self having dissociated itself from the *liṅga-śarīra* becomes one with Brahman, just as the river becomes one with the sea. This is not a case of identity, but one of non-difference (*liṅga-śarīrā-tmaka-ṣoḍaśa-kala-śūnyena ekatām avi-bhāga-lakṣanā-bhedam atyantam vrajet*). Here in the state of *mukti* the identity and difference of *jīva* and Brahman have been indicated on the analogy of the river and the sea.

Bhikṣu says that there is a difference between the Sāṃkhya and Yoga regarding the attainment of emancipation. The followers of the Sāṃkhya can attain emancipation only by the cessation of their *prārabdha karmas*. Since *avidyā* has been destroyed, the realization of emancipation has only to wait till the *prārabdhas* exhaust themselves. The followers of Yoga, however, who enter into a state of *asamprajñāta-samādhi* have not to suffer the fruits of the *prārabdha*,

because being in a state of *asamprajñāta* meditation the *prārabdha* can no longer touch them. They can, therefore, immediately enter into a state of emancipation at their own sweet will.

According to Bhikṣu, though *Īśvara* transcends the *guṇas*, yet through his body as pure *sattva* he carries on the creative work and the work of superintending and controlling the affairs of the universe. Though his agency is manifested through his body as pure *sattva* as a directive activity, yet it is without any association of passions, antipathies, etc.

In the third chapter of the *Kūrma Purāṇa* it is said that *pradhāna*, *puruṣa* and *kāla* emerge from *avyakta*, and from them the whole world came into being. Bhikṣu says that the world did not emanate directly from Brahman but from *pradhāna*, *puruṣa* and *kāla*. There cannot be any direct emanation from Brahman; for that would mean that Brahman undergoes a change. A direct emanation would imply that evil and hell also sprang from Brahman. The emanation of *prakṛti*, *puruṣa* and *kāla* from Brahman is explained on the supposition that Brahman is a kind of ground-cause of *prakṛti*, *puruṣa*, and *kāla* (*abhiivyakti-kāraṇa* or *ādhāra-kāraṇa*). But this emanation of *prakṛti*, *puruṣa* and *kāla* is not through modificatory processes in the manner in which curd is produced from milk. In the time of dissolution *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* are unproductive of any effects and may therefore be regarded as it were as non-existent. It is through the will of God that the *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* are drawn out and connected together, and the point of motivation is started for the processes of modification of the *prakṛti*. This point of motivation is called *kāla*. It is by such a course that all these three may be regarded as producing an effect and therefore as existent. It is in this sense that *prakṛti*, *puruṣa* and *kāla* are regarded as brought into being by God<sup>1</sup>.

*Avyakta* as God is so called because it transcends human knowledge. It is also so called because it is a state of non-duality, where there is no difference between energy and its possessor, and where everything exists in an undifferentiated manner. *Avyakta* used in

<sup>1</sup> na tu sākṣād eva brahmaṇaḥ... atra kālā-dī-trayaśya brahma-kāryatvam abhiivyakti-rūpam eva vivakṣitam... prakṛti-puruṣayoś ca mahad-ādi-kāryo-nmukhataḥ ca parame-śvara-kṛtāḥ anyonya-saṃyogād eva bhavati, evaṃ kālasya prakṛti-puruṣa-saṃyogā-khya-kāryo-nmukhatvaṃ parame-śvare-ccch ayaiva bhavati. *Īśvara-gītā-bhāṣya*. MS.

the sense of *prakṛti* is the basis of change, or change as such; and *puruṣa* denotes the knower.

The *paramā-tman* is spoken of as the soul of all beings. This should not, however, be taken to mean that there is only the *paramātman* which exists and that all things are but false impositions on his nature. The *paramā-tman* or *Parame-śvara* is both different and identical with *kāla*, *pradhāna* and the *puruṣa*. The existence of the *prakṛti* and the *puruṣa* has to be regarded as less ultimate than the existence of God, because the existence of the former is relative as compared with the existence of God (*vikārāpekṣayā sthīratvena apekṣakam etayos tattvam*, p. 44). Time is regarded as an instrumental cause of the connection of *prakṛti* and *puruṣa*. Time is a superior instrumental agent to deeds, for the deeds are also produced by time (*karmā-dīnam api kāla-janyatvāt*). Though the time is beginningless, yet it has to be admitted that it has a special function with reference to each specific effect it produces. It is for that reason that at the point of dissolution time does not produce the evolutes of *mahat*, etc. *Mahat-tatva* is in itself a combination of the conscious centres and the material element.

When the word *puruṣa* is used in the singular number, such a use should not be interpreted to mean a denial of the individual *puruṣas*. It only means that in such instances of scriptural texts the word *puruṣa* has been used in a generic sense. *Puruṣas* are also of two kinds—the *apara* and the *para*. Both are in themselves devoid of any qualities and of the nature of pure consciousness. But there is this difference between the *para puruṣa* and the *apara puruṣa*, that while the former never has any kind of association with any experience of pleasure and pain, the latter may sometimes be associated with pleasure and pain which he at that time feels to be his own (*anye guṇā-bhimānāt saguṇā iva bhavanti paramātmā tu guṇā-bhimāna-śūnyaḥ*, p. 46). It must be understood, however, that the experiencing of pleasure and pain is not an indispensable part of the definition of *puruṣa*, for at the stage of *jīvan-mukti* the *puruṣas* do not identify themselves with the experiences of pleasure and pain, but they are still *puruṣas* all the same. God, however, who is called the superior *puruṣa*, does not associate Himself with the experiences that proceed as a fruit of *karma* and which are enjoyed in a spatial-temporal manner. But God continues to enjoy eternal bliss in association with His own special *upādhi* or conditions

(*svo-pādhistha-nityā-nanda-bhokṛtvaṃ tu paramā'tmano'pi asti*). When the scriptural texts deny the enjoyment of the experiences of pleasure and pain with regard to the Supreme *puruṣa*, the idea is that though the Supreme *puruṣa* underlies the ordinary *puruṣas* as their ground yet he is not in any way affected by their experiences (*ekasminn eva buddhāv uvasthānena jīva-bhogataḥ prasaktasya paramā-tma-bhogasyai'va pratiśedhaḥ*). So the Supreme *puruṣa* has in common with ordinary *puruṣas* certain experiences of his own. These experiences of pure eternal bliss are due to the direct and immediate reflection of the bliss in the *puruṣa* himself, by which this bliss is directly and immediately experienced by him. By such an experience the *puruṣas* cannot be admitted to suffer any change. He can, however, be aware of the mental states of ordinary persons as well as their experiences of pleasure and pain in a cognitive manner (such as that by which we know external objects) without being himself affected by those experiences. This enjoyment of experience is of course due to the action of God's mind through the process of reflection.

The monism of such a view becomes intelligible when we consider that the *puruṣa*, the *mahat*, the *ahamkāra* and all its products exist in an undifferentiated condition in the very essence of God. The ultimate *puruṣa* as the supreme cognitive principle underlies the very being of *puruṣas* and the faculties such as the *buddhi* and the *ahamkāra*, and also all in later material products. For this reason, by the underlying activity of this principle all our cognitions become possible, for it is the activity of this principle that operates as the faculties of the origins of knowledge. In the case of the experience of pleasure and pain also, though these cannot subsist outside the mind and may not apparently be regarded as requiring any separate organ for their illumination, yet in their case also it is the mind, the *buddhi*, that behaves as the internal organ. So though pleasures and pains cannot be regarded as having an unknown existence, yet their experiences are also interpreted as being due to their reflection in the mind.

When the *mahat* becomes associated with the *puruṣa* and no distinction is felt between it, the *puruṣas* and the original ground-cause, it is then that the cycle of world-existence appears. It is the super-consciousness of God that holds together the objective and the subjective principles. The objective principle, the *prakṛti*, and

the subjective centres, the *puruṣas*, are held together in a state of non-distinction. It is this that gives rise to all experiences of sorrow and bondage with reference to the conscious centres. It may be asked how it is that the *buddhi* and the *puruṣa* are held in non-distinction instead of being distinguished from one another. The reply is that distinction and non-distinction are both possible elements in the *buddhi*, and the function of Yoga is to destroy the obstruction in the way of the realization of such a mutual distinction (*yogā-dinā tu pratibandha-mātram apākrīyate*).

Love of God proceeds in two stages: first, from the notion of God as satisfying our highest needs; and, secondly, in the notion of Him as being one with the self of the devotee. These highest needs find their expression firstly in our notion of value as pleasure and satisfaction in our experiences; secondly, in our notion of value in our emancipation; thirdly, in our notion of value in the satisfaction that we achieve in our realization of the sublimity in experiencing the greatness of God (*Prema ca anurāga-viśeṣaḥ paramā-tmani iṣṭa-sādhana-tā-jñānāt ātmatva-jñānāc ca bhavati. iṣṭam api dvi-vidhaṃ bhogā-pavargau tan-mahimā-darśano-ttha-sukhaṃ ca iti tad evaṃ mātmya-pratipādanasya phalaṃ prema-lakṣaṇā bhaktiḥ*).

*Māyā*, as identified with *prakṛti*, should be regarded as substantive entity. The *prakṛti* has two elements in it, *sattva* and *tamas*. Through *sattva*, wisdom or true knowledge is produced; through *tamas* is produced delusion or false knowledge. It is this aspect of *prakṛti* as producing false knowledge that is called *māyā*. *Māyā* is described as being *triguṇā-tmikā prakṛti* or the *prakṛti* with three *guṇas*. But though the *māyā* is identified with *prakṛti*, yet this identification is due to the fact that the *tamas* side of *prakṛti* cannot be taken as apart from the *prakṛti* as a whole. When it is said in the scriptures that God destroys the *māyā* of Yogins, it does not mean that the *triguṇā-tmikā prakṛti* as a whole is destroyed, but only that the operation of the *tamas* side is suspended or destroyed or ceases only with reference to the Yogin. *Māyā* is also described as that which cannot produce an illusion in Him on whom it has to depend for its existence, i.e. God, but that it can produce illusion or false knowledge in others (*svā-śraya-vyāmohakatve sati para-vyāmohakatvam*).

It is further said that God creates the world by his *māyā-śakti* as composed of the three *guṇas*. The significance of the designation

*māyā* in this connection implies that it is by the false identification of the *prakṛti* and the *puruṣa* that the latter evolutionary process of the formation of the world and world-experience becomes possible. The term *māyā* is generally restricted to *prakṛti* in its relation to God, whereas it is called *avidyā* as a delusive agent with reference to individuals.

True knowledge does not consist in a mere identification with Brahman as pure consciousness, but it means the knowledge of Brahman, his relationship with *pradhāna*, *puruṣa*, and *kāla*, and the manner in which the whole cosmic evolution comes into being, is maintained, and is ultimately dissolved in Brahman; and also in the personal relationship that he has with the individuals, and the manner in which he controls them and the ultimate ways of attaining the final realization. *Kāla* is, again, here referred to as the conditional *upādhi* through which God moves the *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* towards the evolution of the cosmic process.

The great difficulty is to explain how God who is regarded in essence of the nature of pure consciousness and therefore absolutely devoid of desire or will can be the cause of the great union of *prakṛti* with the *puruṣas*. The answer proposed by Bhikṣu is that in God's nature itself there is such a dynamization that through it He can continue the actualizing process and the combining activities of the *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* lying dormant in Him. Though *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* may also be regarded as the causes of the world, yet since the combination happens in time, time may be regarded primarily as a dynamic agent; the condition existing in God through which He renders the union is made possible (*mama svīyo bhāvaḥ padārthah sva-bhāva upādhiḥ tatas tasya preraṇāt bhagavān a-pratihato mahā-yogasya prakṛti-puruṣā-di-saṃyogasya īśvaras tatra samarthah ... prakṛti-prati-kṣaṇa-pariṇāmānam eva kālo-pādhitvāt*). Since God moves both the *prakṛti* and the *puruṣa* through His own dynamic conditions, the whole universe of matter and spirits may be regarded as His body in the sense that they are the passive objects of the activity of God. God is thus conceived as dancing in his activity among his own energies as *prakṛti* and *puruṣas*. It may be argued that *puruṣa* being itself absolutely static, how can these be moved into activity consists of the fact that they are turned to the specific operations or that they are united with the *prakṛti*. Sometimes it is also suggested that the *prakṛti* is the condition of

the *puruṣas* and that the movement of the *prakṛti* in association with the *puruṣas* is interpreted as being the movement of the *puruṣas*.

In the seventh chapter of *Īśvara-gītā* Brahman is defined as the Universal. Thus any cause may be regarded as Brahman in relation to its effect. So there may be a hierarchy of Brahman as we proceed from a lesser universal to a higher universal. The definition of Brahman is: "*yad yasya kāraṇam tat tasya brahma tad-apekṣayā vyāpakatvāt.*" As God contains within Himself all the universals, He is called *brahma-māyā*. God is always associated with the *puruṣas*. But yet His dynamic activity in association with the *puruṣas* consists in bringing about such an association with *prakṛti* that the objects of the world may be manifested to them in the form of knowledge.

The *jīva* or individual is regarded as being a part of God, the relation being similar to that of a son and father. When the *jīvas* dedicate all their actions to God with the conviction that if it is God who works through them, then virtues and vices lose their force and become inefficacious to cause any bondage to them. As all *jīvas* are the parts of God, there is a great similarity between them in spite of their diversity. God exists in the *jīvas* just as the whole exists in the parts.

Vijñāna Bhikṣu conceives of the *adhiṣṭhāna-kāraṇa* as the ground cause, as one which in itself remains the same and yet new differences emerge out of it. This is also his doctrine of the part and the whole. The parts are thus supposed to be emergents from the whole which does not itself participate in any change. The relation is thus not organic in the sense that the dissolution of the parts would mean the dissolution of the whole. In the *pralaya* the parts are dissolved, yet pure Brahman remains just as it was in the stage of creation. So, again, when the parts are affected pleasures and pains are experienced, but the affection of the parts does not involve in the least the affection of the whole. But the whole is not affected by the sufferings that exist in the emergents. It is further stated that it is through the function of the ground-cause that the emergents, e.g. substance, quality and action, can express themselves or operate in their specific forms. The underlying whole, the ground-cause, has really no parts in itself. Yet from this common basis various emergents of appearances as characterized units show themselves, and since they are seen to emerge from it they are in

this specific technical sense called the parts of the underlying ground cause.

It will thus be seen that the Brahman, the ground-cause, always remains unchangeable in itself, but it is said that the Brahman is associated with *māyā* and is united by it (*sa māyī māyayā baddhaḥ*). The idea is that the *māyā* is an integral part of the divine entity and not different from it. *Māyā* is like a part which is identical with the whole.

Though in the scriptures both the distinction and the identity of the individual with the Brahman have often been mentioned, yet it is by the realization of the difference of the individual from the Brahman that the ultimate emancipation can be attained<sup>1</sup>.

In the *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad*, II. 4. 5, it is stated that all other things are desired because we desire the self. Śaṅkara infers from it that we are primarily attached to the self, and since all attachments imply attachment to pleasure, it follows that the self is of the nature of pleasure or bliss. Other things are desired only when they are falsely regarded as ourselves or parts of ourselves. Bhikṣu denies this proposition. He says that firstly it is not true that we are always attached to our own selves; nor, therefore, is it true that seeking of happiness from other sources is always the seeking of the selves. It is, therefore, wrong to suppose that self is of the nature of bliss. If the soul is of the nature of pure consciousness, it cannot be the nature of pure bliss. If bliss and consciousness were the same, all knowledge would imply pleasure, but our knowledge is as much associated with pleasure as with pain. Pleasure and pain, as also egoism (*abhimāna*), belong to *prakṛti* or its product *buddhi* and are transferred through its function (*ṛtti*) to the self, which is the real enjoyer and sufferer of pleasure and pain. The self is thus the real experiencer and the experiences therefore do not belong to the *prakṛti* but to the self<sup>2</sup>. Through the operation of the sense-contact with the object and light the mental states are generated. These mental states are called *ṛtti* and belong to *buddhi* and therefore to *prakṛti*, but corresponding to each such mental state there is an intuition of them on the part of the *puruṣa* (*ṛtti-sākṣātkāra*)

<sup>1</sup> *yady api bheda-bhedā-vubdhau eva śruti-smṛtyoruktau tathā'pi yathokta-bheda-jñāna-rūpa-vivekad eva sarvā-bhimāna-nivṛtyā sākṣāt mokṣaḥ. Iṣvara-gītā. MS.*

<sup>2</sup> *sākṣāt-kāra-rūpa-dharmasya dṛśya-dharmatva-sambhavāt. Bhikṣu's commentary on Iṣvara-gītā. MS.*

and it is this intuition that constitutes the real experience of the *puruṣa*. The word *bhoga* has an ambiguity in meaning. It sometimes refers to the mental states and at other times to their intuition and it is as the former state that the *bhoga* is denied of the *puruṣa*.

The *ajñāna* (ignorance) in this system means false knowledge. When the *puruṣa* intuits the *vyttis* of the *buddhi* and thereby falsely regards those *vyttis* as belonging to itself there is false knowledge which is the cause of the bondage. The intuition in itself is real, but the associations of the intuitive characters with the self are erroneous. When the self knows its own nature as different from the *vyttis* and as a part of Brahman in which it has an undifferentiated reality, we have what is called emancipation. The existence of the self as undifferentiated with Brahman simply means that the Brahman is the ground-cause, and as such an unchangeable ground-cause Brahman is of the nature of pure consciousness. It is in its nature as pure consciousness that the whole world may be regarded as existing in the Brahman of which the *prakṛti* and the *puruṣa*, the one changing by real modifications and the other through the false ascription of the events of *prakṛti* to itself, may be regarded as emergents. The world is ultimately of the nature of pure consciousness, but matter and its changes, and the experience itself are only material and temporary forms bubbling out of it. But since these emergent forms are real emanations from Brahman an over-emphasis on monism would be wrong. The reality consists of both the ground-cause and the emergent forms. Śaṅkara had asserted that the duality was true only so long as the one reality was not reached. But Bhikṣu objecting to it says that since the monistic truth can be attained only by assuming the validity of the processes that imply duality, ultimate invalidation of the dualistic processes will also nullify the monistic conclusion.

## CHAPTER XXIII

### PHILOSOPHICAL SPECULATIONS OF SOME OF THE SELECTED PURĀṆAS

THE readers who have followed the philosophy of the Vedānta as interpreted by Vijñāna Bhikṣu in his commentary on the *Brahma-sūtra* and the *Īśvara-gītā* section of the *Kūrma Purāṇa* must have noticed that, according to him, the Vedānta was associated with the Sāṃkhya and Yoga, and in support of his view he referred to many of the Purāṇas, some of which are much earlier than Śaṅkara. Vijñāna Bhikṣu, therefore, quotes profusely from the Purāṇas and in the writings of Rāmānuja, Madhva, Vallabha, Jīva Goswamī and Baladeva we find profuse references to the Purāṇas in support of their views of the philosophy of the Vedānta.

It is highly probable that at least one important school of ideas regarding the philosophy of the Upaniṣads and the *Brahma-sūtra* was preserved in the Purāṇic tradition. Śaṅkara's interpretation of the Upaniṣads and the *Brahma-sūtra* seems to have diverged very greatly from the semi-realistic interpretation of them as found in the Purāṇas. It was, probably, for this reason that Śaṅkara seldom refers to the Purāṇas; but since Śaṅkara's line of interpretation is practically absent in the earlier Purāṇas, and since the extreme monism of some passages of the Upaniṣads is modified and softened by other considerations, it may be believed that the views of the Vedānta, as found in the Purāṇas and the *Bhagavad-gītā*, present, at least in a general manner, the oldest outlook of the philosophy of the Upaniṣads and the *Brahma-sūtra*.

It seems, therefore, desirable that the treatment of the philosophy of Rāmānuja and Vijñāna Bhikṣu should be supplemented by a short survey of the philosophy as found in some of the principal Purāṇas. All the Purāṇas are required to have a special section devoted to the treatment of creation and dissolution, and it is in this section that the philosophical speculations are largely found<sup>1</sup>. In the present section I shall make an effort to trace the philosophical speculations as contained in the *sarga-pratisarga* portions

<sup>1</sup> *sargaś ca pratisargaś ca vaṃśo manv-antarāṇi ca | vaṃśā-nucaritaṃ cai'va purāṇaṃ pañca-lakṣaṇaṃ. || Kūrma Purāṇa, 1. 12.*

of some of the selected Purāṇas so as to enable readers to compare this Purāṇic philosophy with the philosophy of Bhāskara Rāmānuja, Vijñāna Bhikṣu, and Nimbārka.

The first manifestation of Brahman according to the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* is *puruṣa*; then come the other manifestations as *vyaktā-vyakta* and *kāla*. The original cause of *pradhāna*, *puruṣa*, *vyakta* and *kāla* is regarded as the ultimate state of Viṣṇu. Here then we find Brahma-Viṣṇu<sup>1</sup>.

In *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, 1. 2. 11, it is said that the Ultimate Reality is only pure existence, which can be described only as a position of an eternal existence. It exists everywhere, and it is all (this is Pantheism), and everything is in it (this is Panentheism) and therefore it is called Vāsudeva<sup>2</sup>. It is pure because there is no extraneous entity to be thrown away<sup>3</sup>. It exists in four forms: *vyakta*, *avyakta*, *puruṣa* and *kāla*. Out of His playful activity these four forms have come out<sup>4</sup>. *Prakṛti* is described here as *sadasad-ātmaka*<sup>5</sup> and as *triṣuṇa*<sup>6</sup>. In the beginning there are these four categories: Brahman, *pradhāna*, *puruṣa* and *kāla*<sup>7</sup>, all these being different from the unconditional (*Trikālika*) Viṣṇu. The function of *kāla* is to hold together the *puruṣa* and the *pradhāna* during the creational period, and to hold them apart at the time of dissolution. As such it (*kāla*) is the cause of sensibles. Thus there is a reference to the ontological synthetic activity and the ontological analytical activity of *kāla*<sup>8</sup>. ("Ontological" in the sense that *kāla* appears here not as instrumental of the epistemological aspect of experience, but as something "being" or "existing," i.e. ontological.) As all manifested things had returned to the *prakṛti* at the time of the last dissolution, the *prakṛti* is called *pratiṣaṅcara*<sup>9</sup>. *Kāla* or time is beginningless

<sup>1</sup> Brahman is also regarded as *sraṣṭā*, Hari as *pātā* (Protector), and Maheśvara as *saṃhartā*.

*āpo nārā iti proktā, āpo vai nara-sūnavah  
ayanam tasya tāh pūrvam tena nārāyanah smṛtah.* Manu. 1. 10.

<sup>2</sup> *sarvatrā'sau samastam ca vasaty atre'ti vai yatah.  
tatah sa vāsudeve'ti vidvadbhiḥ paripaṭhyate.* *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, 1. 2. 12.

<sup>3</sup> *Heyā-bhāvāc-ca nirmalam.* *Ibid.* 1. 2. 13.

<sup>4</sup> *vyaktam viṣṇus tathā'vyaktam puruṣaḥ kāla eva ca 1. kṛtato bālakaṣye'va  
ceṣṭām tasya niśumaya.* *Ibid.* 1. 2. 18.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* 1. 2. 19.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* 1. 2. 21.

<sup>7</sup> *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, 1. 2. 23.

<sup>8</sup> *Viṣṇoḥ svarūpāt parato hi tenye rūpe pradhānam puruṣaśca vipra  
tasyai'va tenyena dhyte viyukte rūpā-di yat tad dvija kāla-saṃjñām.*

*Ibid.* 1. 2. 24.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* 1. 2. 25.

and so exists even at the time of dissolution, synthesizing *prakṛti* or *puruṣa* together and also holding them out as different at the time of creation. At that time God enters by His will into *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* and produces a disturbance leading to creation<sup>1</sup>. When God enters into *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* His proximity alone is sufficient to produce the disturbance leading to creation; just as an odorous substance produces sensation of odour by its proximity without actually modifying the mind<sup>2</sup>. He (God) is both the disturber (*kṣobha*) or disturbed (*kṣobhya*), and that is why, through contradiction and dilation, creation is produced<sup>3</sup>. Here is once again the Pantheistic view of God, its first occurrence being manifested ultimately in four main categories, all of which are, so to speak, participating in the nature of God, all of which are His first manifestations, and also in which it is said that all is God, and so on. *Anu* means *jīvā-tman*<sup>4</sup>. Viṣṇu or *Īśvara* exists as the *vikāra*, i.e. the manifested forms, the *puruṣa* and also as Brahman<sup>4</sup>. This is clear Pantheism.

The commentator says that the word "*kṣetrajña*" in "*kṣetrajñā-dhiṣṭhānāt*" means *puruṣa*. But apparently neither the context nor the classical Sāṃkhya justifies it. The context distinctly shows that *kṣetrajña* means *Īśvara*; and the manner of his *adhiṣṭh-āṭṭva* by entering into *prakṛti* and by proximity has already been described<sup>5</sup>. From the *pradhāna* the *mahat-tattva* emerges and it is then covered by the *pradhāna*, and being so covered it differentiates itself as the *sāttvika*, *rājasa* and *tāmasa mahat*. The *pradhāna* covers the *mahat* just as a seed is covered by the skin<sup>6</sup>. Being so covered there spring from the threefold *mahat* the threefold *ahamkāra* called *vaikārika*, *taijasa* and *bhūtā-di* or *tāmasa*. From this *bhūtā-di* or *tāmasa ahamkāra* which is covered by the *mahat* (as the *mahat* itself was covered by *pradhāna*) there springs through its spontaneous self-modification the *śabda-tanmātra*, and by the same process there springs from that *śabda-tanmātra* the *ākāśa*—the gross element. Again, the *bhūtā-di* covers up the *śabda-tanmātra* and the *ākāśa* differentiated from it as the gross element. The *ākāśa*, being thus conditioned, produces spontaneously by self-modification the

<sup>1</sup> *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, 1. 2. 29.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 1. 2. 30.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* 1. 2. 31.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* 1. 2. 32.

<sup>5</sup> *guṇa-sāmyāt tatas tasmāt kṣetrajñā-dhiṣṭhitan mune*

*guṇa-vyañjana-sambhūtiḥ sarga-kāle deṣo-ṭtama.* *Ibid.* 1. 2. 33.

<sup>6</sup> *pradhāna-tattvena samāṇi tvacā bījān ivā'vṛtam.* *Ibid.* 1. 2. 34.

*sparsa-tanmātra*, which produces immediately and directly the gross *vāyu*. The *bhūtādi* again covers up the *ākāśa*, *śabda-tanmātra*, *sparsa-tanmātra* and the differentiated *vāyu* which later then produces the *rūpa-tanmātra* which immediately produces the gross light-heat (*jyoti*)<sup>1</sup>. The *sparsa-tanmātra* and the *vāyu* cover up the *rūpa-tanmātra*. Being thus conditioned, the differentiated gross *jyoti* produces the *rasa-tanmātra* from which again the gross water is produced. In a similar manner the *rasa-tanmātra* and the *rūpa-tanmātra*, being covered up, the differentiated gross water produces the *gandha-tanmātra*, from which again the gross earth is produced. The *tanmātras* are the potential conditions of qualities and hence the qualities are not manifested there. They are, therefore, traditionally called *aviśeṣa*. They do not manifest the threefold qualities of the *guṇas* as *śānta*, *ghora* and *mūḍha*. It is for this reason also that they are called *aviśeṣa*<sup>2</sup>.

From the *taijasa-ahamkāra* the five conative and cognitive senses are produced. From the *vaikārika-ahamkāra* is produced the *manas*<sup>3</sup>. These elements acting together in harmony and unity, together with the *tanmātras*, *ahamkāra* and *mahat*, form the unity of the universe under the supreme control of God. As the universe grows up, they form into an egg which gradually expands from within like a water-bubble; and this is called the materialistic body of Viṣṇu as Brahman. This universe is encircled on the outer side by water, fire, air, the *ākāśa* and the *bhūtā-di* and then by the *mahat* and the *avyakta*, each of which is ten times as large as the earth. There are thus seven coverings. The universe is like a cocoanut fruit with various shell-coverings. In proper time, again by causing a preponderance of *tamas*, God eats up the universe in His form as Rudra, and again creates it in His form as Brahmā. He maintains the world in His form as Viṣṇu. Ultimately, however, as God holds the universe within Him, He is both the creator and the created, the protector and the destroyer.

Though the Brahman is qualityless, unknowable and pure, yet

<sup>1</sup> The commentator notes that when the *ākāśa* is said to produce *sparsa-tanmātra*, it is not the *ākāśa* that does so but the *bhūtā-di* manifesting itself as *ākāśa*, i.e. it is through some accretion from *bhūtā-di* that the *ākāśa* can produce the *sparsa-tanmātra*. *Ākāśaḥ ākāśamayo bhūtā-diḥ sparsa-tanmātram sasarja*.

<sup>2</sup> See the commentary to *śloka*. *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, 1. 2. 44.

<sup>3</sup> The commentator notes that the word *manas* here means *antahkaraṇa*, including its four functions as *manas*, *buddhi*, *citta* and *ahamkāra*.

it can behave as a creative agent by virtue of its specific powers which are incomprehensible to us. As a matter of fact the relation between the powers or energies and the substance is unthinkable. We can never explain how or why fire is hot<sup>1</sup>. The earth, in adoring Hari, described Him as follows: "Whatever is perceived as having visible and tangible forms in this world is but your manifestation. The ordinary people only make a mistake in thinking this to be a naturalistic universe. The whole world is of the nature of knowledge, and the error of errors is to regard it as an object. Those who are wise know that this world is of the nature of thought and a manifestation of God, who is pure knowledge. Error consists in regarding the world as a mere naturalistic object and not as a manifestation of the structure of knowledge."<sup>2</sup>

In the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, I. 4. 50-52, it is said that God is only the dynamic agent (*nimitta-mātram*), the material cause being the energies of the objects of the universe which are to be created. These energies require only a dynamic agent to actualize them in the form of the universe. God is here represented to be only a formative agent, whereas the actual material cause of the world is to be found in the energies which constitute the objects of the world, through the influence and presence of God. The commentator notes that the formative agency of God consists merely in his presence (*sānnidhya-mātreinaiva*)<sup>3</sup>.

In the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, I. 4, we find another account of creation. It is said that God in the beginning thought of creation, and an unintelligent creation appeared in the form of *tamas*, *moha*, *mahā-moha*, *tāmisra* and *andha-tāmisra*. These were the five kinds of *avidyā* which sprang from the Lord. From these there came a creation of the five kinds of plants as *vṛkṣa*, *gulma*, *latā*, *virūṭ* and

<sup>1</sup> *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, I. 3. 1-2.

<sup>2</sup> *yad etad dṛśyate mūrtam, etad jñānā-tmanas tava.*  
*bhṛānti-jñānena paśyanti jagad-rūpam ayogināḥ.* *Ibid.* I. 4. 39.  
*jñāna-svarūpam akhilam jagad etad abuddhayaḥ*  
*artha-svarūpam paśyanto bhrāmyante moha-saṃplave.*

<sup>3</sup> *nimitta-mātram eva'stī srjyānām sarga-karmaṇi*  
*pradhāna-kāraṇi-bhūtā yato vai srjya-śaktayaḥ.* *Ibid.* I. 4. 51.  
*nimitta-mātram muktvai'kaṃ nā'nyat kiñcid avekṣyate*  
*nityate tapatām śreṣṭha sva-śaktiḥ vastu vastutām.* *Ibid.* I. 4. 52.  
*sistṛkṣuḥ śakti-yukto'sau srjya-śakti-pracoditaḥ.* *Ibid.* I. 5. 65.

In this passage it is hinted that the will of God and His power to create is helped by the energies of the objects to be created.

*tṛṇa* (to which are to be added the mountains and the hills) which have no inner or outer consciousness and may be described as having, as it were, closed souls (*saṁvṛtā-tman*). Not being satisfied with this He created the animals and birds, etc., called *tiryak-srota*. The animals, etc., are called *tiryag*, because their circulation is not upwards but runs circularly in all directions. They are full of *tamas*, and are described as *avedinah*. The commentator notes that what is meant by the term *avedin* is that the animals have only appetitive knowledge, but no synthetic knowledge, i.e. cannot synthesise the experience of the past, the present and the future and cannot express what they know, and they have no knowledge about their destinies in this world and in the other, and are devoid of all moral and religious sense. They have no discrimination regarding cleanliness and eating; they are satisfied with their ignorance as true knowledge, i.e. they do not seek the acquirement of certain knowledge. They are associated with the twenty-eight kinds of *vādhā*<sup>1</sup>. They are aware internally of pleasure and pain but they cannot communicate with one another<sup>2</sup>. Then, being dissatisfied with the animal creation, God created "the gods" who are always happy and can know both their inner feelings and ideas, and also the external objects, and communicate with one another. Being dissatisfied with that creation also He created "men," which creation is called *arvāk-srotas* as distinguished from the creation of gods which is called *ūrddhva-srotas*. These men have an abundance of *tamas* and *rajas*, and they have therefore a preponderance of

<sup>1</sup> In the *Sāṃkhya-kārikā*, 49, we hear of twenty-eight *vādhās*. The reference to *vādhās* here is clearly a reference to the technical *vādhās* of the Sāṃkhya philosophy, where it also seems certain that at the time of *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* the technical name of the Sāṃkhya *vādhās* must have been a very familiar thing. It also shows that the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* was closely associated with the Sāṃkhya circles of thought, so that the mere allusion to the term *vādhā* was sufficient to refer to the Sāṃkhya *vādhās*. The *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* was probably a work of the third century A.D.; and the *Kārikā* of Īśvara Kṛṣṇa was composed more or less at the same time. In the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa* (Venkatesvara edition, ch. 44, v. 20) we have the reading *Aṣṭāvimsad-vidhātṃ*. In the B. 1. edition of *Mārkaṇḍeya* by K. M. Banerji we have also in ch. 47, v. 20, the same reading. The reading *vādhānviṭ* occurs neither in the *Mārkaṇḍeya* nor in the *Padma Purāṇa* 13, 65. The supposition, therefore, is that the twenty-eight kinds in *Mārkaṇḍeya* were changed into twenty-eight kinds of *vādhā* through the Sāṃkhya influence in the third century. The *Mārkaṇḍeya* is supposed to have been written in the first half of the second century B.C. It is not easy to guess what twenty-eight kinds of animal creation were intended by Mārkaṇḍeya. But the identification of them with the twenty-eight kinds of Sāṃkhya *vādhā* seems to be quite inappropriate.

<sup>2</sup> *antaḥ prakāśās te sarva āvṛtās tu paras-param. Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, 1. 5. 10.

suffering. There are thus nine creations. The first three, called the unintelligent creation (*avuddhi-pūrvaka*), is the naturalistic creation of (i) *mahat*, (ii) the *tanmātras*, and (iii) the *bhūtas*, the physiological senses. The fourth creation, called also the primary creation (*mūkhya-sarga*), is the creation of plants; fifth is the creation of the *tiryag-srotas*; sixth the *ūrdha-srotas*; seventh the *arvāk-srotas* or men. The eighth creation seems to be the creation of a new kind. It probably means the distinctive characteristic of destiny of each of the four creations, plants, animals, gods and men. The plants have, for their destiny, ignorance; the animals have mere bodily energy; the gods have pure contentment; and the men have the realization of ends. This is called the *anugraha-sarga*<sup>1</sup>. Then comes the ninth *sarga*, called the *kaumāra-sarga*, which probably refers to the creation of the mental children of God such as *Sanatkumāra*, etc.

There are four kinds of *pralayas*: they are called the *naimittika* or *brāhma*, the *prākṛtika*, the *ātyantika* and the *nitya*. The *naimittika-pralaya* takes place when Brahmā sleeps; the *prākṛtika* occurs when the universe merges in *prakṛti*; the *ātyantika-pralaya* is the result of the knowledge of God, i.e. to say, when Yogins lose themselves in *paramā-tman*, then occurs the *ātyantika-pralaya*; and the fourth, viz. the *nitya-pralaya*, is the continual destruction that takes place daily.

In the *Vāyu Purāṇa* we hear of an ultimate principle which is associated with the first causal movement of God. This is regarded as the transcendental cause (*kāraṇam aprameyam*) and is said to be known by various names, such as Brahman, *pradhāna*, *prakṛti*, *prasūti* (*prakṛti-prasūti*), *ātman*, *guha*, *yoni*, *cakṣus*, *kṣetra*, *amṛta*,

<sup>1</sup> The *Vāyu Purāṇa*, vi. 68, describes it as follows:

*sthāvařeṣu viparyāsaḥ tiryag-yoniṣu śaktiā  
siddhā-tmāno manuṣyāḥ tu tuṣṭir deveṣu kṛtsnaśaḥ.*

The sixth *sarga* is there described as being of the ghosts.

*bhūtā-dikānāṃ sattvānāṃ śaṣṭhaḥ sargaḥ sa ucyate.*

*Ibid.* vi. 58-59.

*te parigrahiṇaḥ sarve saṃvibhāga-ratāḥ punaḥ.*

*khādanāś cā'py aśilāś ca jñeyā bhūtā-dikāś ca te.* *Ibid.* vi. 30.

In the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*, *anugraha-sarga* is described as the fifth *sarga*.

In the *Kūrma Purāṇa*, 7. 11, these *bhūtas* are regarded as being the fifth *sarga*. The *Kūrma Purāṇa* describes the first creation as the *mahat-sarga*, the second as *bhūta-sarga*, the third as *Vaikārike-ndriya-sarga*, the fourth as the *mukhya-sarga*, and the fifth as *tiryak-sarga*. There is thus a contradiction, as the fifth *sarga* was described in the eleventh verse in the same chapter as the creation of ghosts. This implies the fact that probably two hands were at work at different times, at least in the seventh chapter of the *Kūrma Purāṇa*.

*akṣara, śukra, tapas, satyam, atiprakāśa*. It is said to cover round the second *puruṣa*. This second *puruṣa* is probably the *loka-pitā-maha*. Through the association of time and preponderance of *rajas* eight different stages of modification are produced which are associated with *kṣetrajña*<sup>1</sup>. In this connection the *Vāyu Purāṇa* speaks also of the *prākṛtika*, the *naimittika* and the *ātyantika-pralaya*<sup>2</sup>. It also says that the categories of evolution have been discovered both by the guidance of the *śāstras* and by rational argument<sup>3</sup>, and that *prakṛti* is devoid of all sensible qualities. She is associated with three *guṇas*, and is timeless and unknowable in herself. In the original state, in the equilibrium of *guṇas*, everything was pervaded by her as *tamas*. At the time of creation, being associated with *kṣetrajña*, *mahat* emerges from her. This *mahat* is due to a preponderance of *sattva* and manifests only pure existence. This *mahat* is called by various names, such as *manas, mahat, mati, brahmā, pur, buddhi, khyāti, Īśvara, citi, prajñā, smṛti, saṃvit, vipura*<sup>4</sup>. This *mahat-prajñā*, being stirred by desire to create, begins the work of creation and produces *dharma, adharma* and other entities<sup>5</sup>. Since the cause of the gross efforts of all beings exists always as conceived in a subtle state in the *mahat*, it is called "*manas*." It is the first of all categories, and of infinite extent and is thus called *mahān*. Since it holds within itself all that is finite and measurable and since it conceives all differentiations from out of itself and appears as intelligent *puruṣa*, by its association with experience it is called *mati*. It is called *brahman* since it causes all growth. Further, as all the later categories derive their material from it, it is called *pur*. Since the *puruṣa* understands all things as beneficial and desirable and since it is also the stuff through which all understanding is possible, it is called *buddhi*. All experience and integration of experience and all suffering and enjoyment depending upon knowledge proceed from it; therefore it is called *khyāti*. Since it directly knows everything as the great Soul it is called *Īśvara*. Since all sense-perceptions are produced from it, it is called *prajñā*. Since all states of knowledge and all kinds of

<sup>1</sup> *Vāyu Purāṇa*, 3. 11, and compare the *Pañcarātra* doctrine as elaborated in *Ahīrbudhnyā*.

<sup>2</sup> *Vāyu Purāṇa*, 3. 23.

<sup>3</sup> *tac-chāstra-yuktyā sva-mati-prayatnāt*

*śamastam dviṣkṛta-dhī-dhṛtibhyaḥ.*

*Ibid.* 3. 24.

It speaks of five *pramāṇas*. *Ibid.* 4. 16.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* 4. 25.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* 4. 24.

*karman* and their fruits are collected in it for determining experience, it is called *citi*. Since it remembers the past, it is called *smṛti*. Since it is the storehouse of all knowledge, it is called *mahā-tman*. Since it is the knowledge of all knowledge, and since it exists everywhere and everything exists in it, it is *saṃvit*. Since it is of the nature of knowledge, it is called *jñāna*. Since it is the cause of all desideratum of conflicting entities, it is called *vipura*. Since it is the Lord of all beings in the world, it is called *Īśvara*. Since it is the knower in both the *kṣetra* and the *kṣetrajña*, and is one, it is called *ka*. Since it stays in the subtle body (*purīyāṃ śete*) it is called *puruṣa*. It is called *svayambhu*, because it is uncaused and the beginning of creation. *Mahān* being stirred up by the creative desire manifests itself in creation through two of its movements, conception (*saṃkalpa*) and determination (*adhyavasāya*). It consists of three *guṇas*, *sattva*, *rajas*, and *tamas*. With the preponderance of *rajas*, *ahaṃkāra* emerged from *mahat*. With the preponderance of *tamas* there also emerges from *mahat*, *bhūtā-di*, from which the *bhūtas* and *tanmātras* are produced. From this comes the *ākāśa* as vacuity which is associated with sound. From the modification of the *bhūtā-di* the sound-potential (*śabda-tanmātra*) has been produced. When the *bhūtādi* covers up the sound-potential, then the touch-potential was produced. When the *ākāśa* covers up the sound-potential and the touch-potential, the *vāyu* is produced. Similarly the other *bhūtas* and qualities are produced. The *tanmātras* are also called *aviśeṣas*. From the *vaikārika* or *sāttvika-ahaṃkāra* are produced the five cognitive and the five conative senses and the *manas*<sup>1</sup>.

These *guṇas* work in mutual co-operation, and thereby produce the cosmic egg like a water-bubble. From this cosmic egg, the *kṣetrajña* called *Brahmā*—also called *Hiranyagarbha* (the four-faced God)—is produced. This god loses His body at the time of each *pralaya* and gains a new body at the time of a new creation<sup>2</sup>. The cosmic egg is covered by water, light, heat, air, *ākāśa*, *bhūtādi*, *mahat*, and *avyakta*. The eight *prakṛtis* are also spoken of, and probably the cosmic egg is the eighth cover<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> This is different from other accounts. No function is ascribed to the *rājasa ahaṃkāra*, from which the conative senses are generally derived.

<sup>2</sup> *Vāyu Purāṇa*, 4. 68.

<sup>3</sup> The passage is obscure, as it is difficult to find out exactly what these eight *prakṛtis* are. *Ibid.* 4. 77-78.

In Chapter VIII it is said that *rajas* remains as the dynamic principle inherent in *sattva* and *tamas*, just as oil remains in seas *amum*. It is further said that Maheśvara entered the *pradhāna* and *puruṣa*, and with the help of the dynamic principle of *rajas* produced a disturbance in the equilibrium of the *prakṛti*<sup>1</sup>. By the disturbance of the *guṇas* three gods are produced, from *rajas* Brahmā, from *tamas* Agni, and from *sattva* Viṣṇu. The Agni is also identified with *kāla* or Time.

The *Vāyu Purāṇa* also describes the nature of *māheśvara-yoga*<sup>2</sup>. This is said to be constituted of five elements or *dharma*s, such as *prāṇāyāma*, *dhyāna*, *pratyāhāra*, *dhāraṇā*, and *smaraṇa*. *Prāṇāyāma* is of three kinds, *manda*, *madhyama*, and *uttama*. *Manda* is of twelve *mātrās*, *madhyama* of twenty-four, and *uttama* of thirty-six. When the *vāyu* is once controlled by gradual practice, then all sins are burnt and all bodily imperfections are removed. By *dhyāna* one should contemplate the qualities of God. Then *prāṇāyāma* is said to bring about four kinds of results: (i) *śānti*, (ii) *prasānti*, (iii) *dīpti*, and (iv) *prasāda*. *Śānti* means the washing away of sins derived from impurities from parents and from the association of one's relations. *Prasānti* means the destruction of personal sins, as greed, egotism, etc. *Dīpti* means the rise of a mystical vision by which one can see past, present and future and come in contact with the wise sages of the past and become like Buddha. *Prasāda* means the contentment and pacification of the senses, sense-objects, mind, and the five *vāyus*.

The process of *prāṇāyāma* beginning with *āsana* is also described. *Pratyāhāra* is regarded as the control of one's desires and *dharma* is regarded as the fixing of the mind on the tip of the nose, or the middle of the eyebrows, or at a point slightly higher than that. Through *pratyāhāra* the influence of external objects is negated. By *dhyāna* one perceives oneself like the sun or the moon, i.e. there is an unobstructed illumination. The various miraculous powers that the *yogī* attains are called the *upāsargas* and it is urged that one should always try to keep oneself free from the callings of these miraculous powers. The various objects of *dhyāna*

<sup>1</sup> It has been noted before that the creation of the material world proceeded from the *tāmasa ahaṁkāra*, and that of the cognitive and conative senses from the *sāttvika ahaṁkāra*. The *rājasa ahaṁkāra* was not regarded as producing anything, but merely as a moment leading to disturbance of equilibrium. See also *Vāyu Purāṇa*, 3. 9.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* chap. 11-15.

are regarded as being the elements originating from the earth, *manas* and *buddhi*. The Yogin has to take these objects one by one, and then to leave them off, so that he may not be attached to any one of them. When he does so and becomes unattached to any one of these seven and concentrates on Maheśvara associated with omniscience, contentment, beginningless knowledge, absolute freedom (*svātantrya*), unobstructed power, and infinite power, he attains Brahman. So the ultimate object of Yoga realization is<sup>1</sup> the attainment of Brahmahood as Maheśvara which is also called *apavarga*<sup>2</sup>.

In the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*, yoga is described as a cessation of *ajñāna* through knowledge, which is, on the one hand, emancipation and unity with Brahman, and, on the other, dissociation from the *guṇas* of *prakṛti*<sup>3</sup>. All sorrows are due to attachment. With the cessation of attachment there is also the cessation of the feeling of identifying all things with oneself (*mamatva*); and this leads to happiness. True knowledge is that which leads to emancipation, all else is *ajñāna*. By experiencing the fruits of virtues and vices through the performance of duties and other actions, through the accumulation of fruits of past *karman* (*apūrva*), and through the exhaustion of certain others, there is the bondage of *karma*. The emancipation from *karma*, therefore, can only result from an opposite procedure. The *prāṇāyāma* is supposed to destroy sins<sup>4</sup>. In the ultimate stage the *yogī* becomes one with Brahman, just as water thrown in water becomes one with it<sup>5</sup>. There is no reference here to *chitta-vṛtti-nirodha* as yoga.

Vāsudeva is described here as the ultimate Brahman, who by His creative desire has created everything through the power of time. Through this power He separated the two entities of *pra-*

<sup>1</sup> There is no reference in the chapters on yoga of the *Vāyu Purāṇa* to *vṛtti-nirodha* and *kaivalya*.

<sup>2</sup> There is a chapter both in the *Vāyu Purāṇa* and in the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa* on *arīṣṭa*, similar to what is found in the *Jayākhyā-saṃhitā* where signs are described by which the *yogin* is to know the time of his death, though the description of his death is entirely different from that given in the other two works.

<sup>3</sup> *jñāna-pūrvā viyogo yo'jñānena saha yoginaḥ | sā muktir brahmaṇā cai'kyaṃ anaiḥkyaṃ prakṛtair guṇaiḥ*. || *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*, 39. 1.

<sup>4</sup> The method of *prāṇāyāma* and other processes of yoga is more or less the same as that found in the *Vāyu Purāṇa*.

<sup>5</sup> *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*, 40. 41.

The *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*, in this connection, says that the *yogin* should know the approach of his death by the signs described in ch. 40, so that he may anticipate it and may not get dispirited.

*dhāna* and *puruṣa* from within Himself and connected them both. The first entity that emerged from *prakṛti* in this creative process was *mahat*, from which emerged *ahamkāra*, and from which again emerged *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*. From *tamas* came the five *tan-mātras* and the five *bhūtas*; from *rajas* came the ten senses and the *buddhi*. From *sattva* came the presiding gods of the senses and the *manas*<sup>1</sup>. It is further said that Vāsudeva exists in the *prakṛti* and the *puruṣas* and all the effects, both as pervading through them and also separate from them, that is, He is both immanent and transcendent. Even when He exists as pervading through them, He is not in any way touched by their limitations and impurities. True knowledge is that which takes account of the nature of all those which have emanated from Vāsudeva in their specific forms as *prakṛti*, *puruṣa*, etc., and also of Vāsudeva in His pure and transcendent form<sup>2</sup>.

It should be noted that in the *Padma Purāṇa* there is a mention of *brahma-bhakti*, which is either *kāyika*, *vācika* and *mānasika* or *laukikī*, *vaidikī* and *ādhyātmikī*. This *ādhyātmikī-bhakti* is further subdivided into the *sāṃkhya-bhakti* and *yoga-bhakti*<sup>3</sup>. The knowledge of twenty-four principles and of their distinction from the ultimate principle called *puruṣa*, as also of the relation among *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* and the individual soul, is known as *sāṃkhya-bhakti*<sup>4</sup>. Practice of *prāṇayāma* and meditation upon the Lord Brahma constitute the *yoga-bhakti*<sup>5</sup>. The term *bhakti* is here used in a very special sense.

In *Nāradiya Purāṇa* Nārāyaṇa is said to be the Ultimate Reality, that is, if seen in theological perspective it may be said to create from itself Brahmā the creator, Viṣṇu the protector and preserver, and Rudra the destroyer<sup>6</sup>. This Ultimate Reality has also been called *Mahā-viṣṇu*<sup>7</sup>. It is through his characteristic power that the universe is created. This *śakti* or power is said to be both of the type of existence and non-existence, both *vidyā* and *avidyā*<sup>8</sup>. When the universe is seen as dissociated from *Mahā-viṣṇu*, the vision is clearly due to *avidyā* ingrained in us; when, on the other hand, the consciousness of the distinction between the knower and the known disappears and only the consciousness of

<sup>1</sup> *Skanda Purāṇa*, II. 9. 24, verses 1-10.

<sup>2</sup> *Padma Purāṇa*, I. 15, verses 164-177.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* verses 187-190.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* verse 9.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* verses 65-74.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* verses 177-186.

<sup>7</sup> *Nāradiya Purāṇa*, I. 3. 4.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* verse 7.

unity pervades, it is due to *vidyā* (it is *vidyā* itself)<sup>1</sup>. And just as Hari permeates or pervades through the universe, so also does His *śakti*<sup>2</sup>. Just as the quality of heat exists by pervading, i.e. as in and through Agni its support, even so the *śakti* of Hari can never be dissociated from Him<sup>3</sup>. This *śakti* exists in the form of *vyaktā-vyakta*, pervading the whole universe. *prakṛti*, *puruṣa* and *kāla* are her first manifestations<sup>4</sup>. As this *śakti* is not separate from *Mahā-viṣṇu*, it is said that at the time of first or original creation *Mahā-viṣṇu*, being desirous of creating the universe, becomes, i.e. takes the forms of *prakṛti*, *puruṣa* and *kāla*. From *prakṛti*, disturbed by the presence of the *puruṣa*, comes out *mahat*, and from *mahat* comes into existence *buddhi*, and from *buddhi*, *ahaṃkāra*<sup>5</sup>.

This Ultimate Principle has also been called Vāsudeva, who is said to be the ultimate knowledge and the ultimate goal<sup>6</sup>.

Sorrow or misery of three kinds is necessarily experienced by all beings born in the universe—and the only remedy that sets them free from misery is the final obtaining of the Lord (or God)<sup>7</sup>. The ways to find God are two, the way of knowledge (*jñāna*) and that of action (*karma*). This *jñāna* springs up either from the learning of scriptural texts or from *viveka* (discriminative knowledge)<sup>8</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> *Nāradya Purāṇa*, 1. 3, verses 7–9.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* verse 12.

It should be distinctly noted here that the creation of the universe has been attributed to Hari through the *upādhi avidyā*, which is His own *śakti*. The whole account sounds the note of the Vedānta philosophy. The following line should be particularly noted:

*avidyo-pādhi-yogena tathe'dam akhilaṃ jagat. Ibid.* 3. 12.

And this line should be read with the previous verse—

*viṣṇu-śakti-samudbhūtam etat sarvaṃ carā-caṛaṃ  
yasmād bhinnam idam sarvaṃ yacce'gaṃ yacca teṅgati  
upādhibhir yathā'kāśo bhinnatvena pratyate.*

*Ibid.* verses 10–11.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* verse 13.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* verse 17.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* verses 28, 31.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* verse 80.

<sup>7</sup> For the concept of *antaryāmin* see verse 26 of *Adhyāya* 3 and also verse 48 of *Adhyāya* 33.

<sup>8</sup> *Nāradya Purāṇa*, verses 4, 5.

*utpattim pralayaṃ ca'iva bhūtānāṃ agatim gatim  
veti vidyāṃ avidyāṃ ca sa vācya bhagavān iti  
jñāna-śakti-balai-śvarya-vīrya-tejāṃsy aśeṣataḥ  
bhagavac-śabda-vācya'yaṃ vinā heyair guṇā-dibhiḥ  
sarvaṃ hi tatra bhūtāni vasanti paramā-tmani  
bhūteṣu vasate sántar vāsudevas tataḥ smṛtaḥ.  
bhūteṣu vasate sántar vasanty atra ca tāni yat  
dhātā vidhātā jagatāṃ vāsudevas tatas smṛtaḥ.*

*Ibid.* 1. 46, verses 21–24.

The attributes of Vāsudeva are described in following four verses. It should also be noted that Bhagavān means Vāsudeva. (*Ibid.* verse 19.)

*yoga* is also defined in the next chapter. It is described as *Brahma-laya*. The *manas* is the cause of bondage and emancipation. Bondage means association with sense-objects, and emancipation means dissociation from them. When, like a magnet, the self draws the mind inside and directs its activities in an inward direction and ultimately unites with Brahman, that is called *yoga*<sup>1</sup>.

Viṣṇu is described as having three kinds of *śakti* (power): *parā* or ultimate, the *aparā* (which is identical with individual efforts), and a third power which is called *vidyā* and *karma*<sup>2</sup>. All energies belong to Viṣṇu, and it is through His energies that all living beings are moved into activity<sup>3</sup>.

The word *bhakti* has also been used in another chapter in the sense of *śraddhā*, and is held to be essential for all the various actions of life<sup>4</sup>.

According to the *Kūrma Purāṇa* it seems that God exists firstly as the unmanifested, infinite, unknowable and ultimate director. But He is also called the unmanifested, eternal, cosmic cause which is both being and non-being and is identified with *prakṛti*. In this aspect He is regarded as *para-brahman*, the equilibrium of the three *guṇas*. In this state the *puruṣa* exists within Himself as it were, and this is also called the state of *prākṛta-pralaya*. From this state of unmanifestedness God begins to assert Himself as God and enters into *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* by His own inner intimate contact. This existence of God may be compared with the sex-impulse in man or woman which exists within them and manifests itself only as a creative impulse although remaining one and the same with them all the while. It is for this reason that God is regarded as both passive (*kṣobhya*) and dynamic (*kṣobhaka*). It is therefore said that God behaves as *prakṛti* by self-contraction and dilatation. From the disturbed *prakṛti* and the *puruṣa* sprang up the seed of *mahat*, which is of the nature of both *pradhāna* and *puruṣa* (*pradhāna*

<sup>1</sup> *ātma-prayatna-sāpekṣā vitiṣṭā yā mano-gatiḥ*  
*tasyā brahmaṇi saṃyogo yoga ity abhidhīyate.*

*Nāradya Purāṇa*, 47. 7.

There is also a description of *prāṇāyāma*, *yama*, and *niyama*, etc., from v. 8 to v. 20.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 1. 47, verses 36-38.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* verses 47-49.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* 1, verse 4.

<sup>5</sup> *Kārma Purāṇa* contains the following verse:

*maheśvaraḥ paro'vyaktaḥ catur-vyūhaḥ sanātanaḥ*  
*anantaḥ cā'prameyaḥ ca miyantaḥ sarvato-mukhaḥ.*

(4. 5.)

Two points should be noted here. Firstly, that the Ultimate Reality has been called *Maheśvara* and not *Viṣṇu*. Secondly, *catur-vyūha* is one of the adjectives mentioned in this verse to explain the nature of that Ultimate Reality.

*puruṣāt-makam*). From this came into existence *mahat*, also called *ātman*, *matī*, *brahmā*, *prabuddhi*, *khyāti*, *Īśvara*, *prajñā*, *dhṛti*, *smṛti*, *saṃvit*. From this *mahat* came out the threefold *ahaṃkāra-vaikārika*, *taijasa* and *bhūtādi* (also called *tāmasa ahaṃkāra*). This *ahaṃkāra* is also called *abhimāna*, *kartā*, *mantā*, and *ātman*, for all our efforts spring from this.

It is said that there is a sort of cosmic mind called *manas* which springs directly from the *avyakta* and is regarded as the first product which superintends the evolution of the *tāmasa ahaṃkāra* into its products<sup>1</sup>. This *manas* is to be distinguished from the *manas* or the sense which is the product of both the *taijasa* and *vaikārika ahaṃkāra*.

Two kinds of views regarding the evolution, the *tanmātras* and the *bhūtas*, are given here in succession, which shows that the *Kūrma Purāṇa* must have been revised; and the second view, which is not compatible with the first, was incorporated at a later stage. These two views are as follows:

(1) *Bhūtādi* has, in its development, created the *śabda-mātra*, from which sprang into existence the *ākāśa*, which has sound as its quality. The *sparsa-mātra* was created from the *ākāśa*, developing itself; and from the *sparsa-tanmātra* came out *vāyu*, which, consequently has *sparsa* as its quality. *Vāyu*, in the state of development, created the *rūpa-mātra* from which came into existence *jyoti* (light-heat), which has colour (*rūpa*) as its quality. From this *jyoti*, in the condition of development, sprang up *rasa-mātra* (taste-potential), which created water, which has taste for its quality. The water, in the state of development, created the smell-potential (*gandha-mātra*), from which came into existence the conglomeration, which has smell as its quality.

(2) *Ākāśa* as the sound-potential covered up the touch-potential, and from this sprang up *vāyu*, which has therefore two qualities—the sound and touch. Both the qualities, *śabda* and *sparsa*, entered the colour-potential, whence sprang up the *vahni* (fire), with three qualities—the *śabda*, the *sparsa*, and the *rūpa*. These qualities, viz. *śabda*, *sparsa* and *rūpa*, entered the taste-potential, whence came into existence water having four qualities

<sup>1</sup> *manas tu avyakta-jaṃ pro'ktaṃ vikāraḥ prathamah smṛtaḥ  
yenā'sau jāyate kartā bhūtā-dīpī cā'nupaśyati.*

—*śabda*, *sparsa*, *rūpa* and *rasa*. These four qualities entered smell-potential, from which sprang into existence gross *bhūmi* (the earth), which has all the five qualities of *śabda*, *sparsa*, *rūpa*, *rasa*, and *gandha*.

*Mahat*, *ahamkāra* and the five *tanmātras* are in themselves unable to produce the orderly universe, which is effected through the superintendence of the *puruṣa* (*puruṣā-dhiṣṭhitatvāc ca*) and by the help of *avyakta* (*avyaktā-nugraheṇa*). The universe thus created has seven coverings. The production of the universe, and its maintenance and ultimate dissolution, are all effected through the playful activity (*sva-līlayā*) of God for the benefit of his devotees<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> The God is called Nārāyaṇa, because He is the ultimate support of all human beings:

*nārāṇām ayanam yasmāt tena nārāyaṇas smṛtaḥ.*

*Kūrma Purāṇa*, iv. 62.

## APPENDIX TO VOLUME I

### THE *LOKĀYATA*, *NĀSTIKA* AND *CĀRVĀKA*

THE materialistic philosophy known as the *Lokāyata*, the *Cārvāka* or the *Bārhaspatya* is probably a very old school of thought. In the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* a number of heretical views are referred to and among these we find the doctrine which regarded matter or the elements (*bhūtāni*) as the ultimate principle. The name *Lokāyata* is also fairly old. It is found in Kauṭilya's *Artha-śāstra*, where it is counted with Śaṃkhya and Yoga as a logical science (*ānvīkṣikī*)<sup>1</sup>. Rhys Davids has collected a number of Pāli passages in which the word *Lokāyata* occurs and these have been utilized in the discussion below<sup>2</sup>. Buddhaghoso speaks of *Lokāyata* as a *vitandā-vāda-sattham*<sup>3</sup>. *Vitandā* means tricky disputation and it is defined in the *Nyāya-sūtra*, 1. 2. 3, as that kind of tricky logical discussion (*jalpa*) which is intended only to criticize the opponent's thesis without establishing any other counter-thesis (*sā pratipakṣa-sthāpanā-hīnā vitandā*), and it is thus to be distinguished from *vāda* which means a logical discussion undertaken in all fairness for upholding a particular thesis. *Vitandā*, however, has no thesis to uphold, but is a kind of *jalpa* or tricky argument which seeks to impose a defeat on the opponent by wilfully giving a wrong interpretation of his words and arguments (*chala*), by adopting false and puzzling analogies (*jāti*), and thus to silence or drive him to self-contradiction and undesirable conclusions (*nigraha-sthāna*) by creating an atmosphere of confusion. But *vitandā* cannot then be a *vāda*, for *vāda* is a logical discussion for the ascertainment of truth, and thus the word *vitandā-vāda* would be self-contradictory. Jayanta, however, points out that the Buddhists did not make any distinction

<sup>1</sup> Kauṭilya, *Artha-śāstra*, 1. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Dialogues of the Buddha*, vol. 1, p. 166. In recent times two Italian scholars, Dr Piszzagalli and Prof. Tucci, have written two works called *Nāstika*, *Cārvāka Lokāyatika* and *Linee di una storia del Materialismo Indiano* respectively in which they attempt to discover the meaning of the terms *nāstika*, *cārvāka* and *lokāyata* and also the doctrines of the sects. Most of the Pāli passages which they consider are those already collected by Rhys Davids.

<sup>3</sup> *Abhidhāna-ppadīpikā*, v. 112, repeats Buddhaghoso's words "*vitandā-sattham viññeyam yaṃ tam lokāyatam*."

between a pure logical argument and a tricky disputation and used the same word *vāda* to denote both these forms of argument<sup>1</sup>. This explains why *Lokāyata*, though consisting merely of *vitandā*, could also be designated as *vāda* in Buddhist literature. A few examples of this *vitandā* are given by Buddhaghosa in the same commentary in explaining the term "*loka-khāyikā*" (lit. "popular story," but "popular philosophy" according to P.T.S. Pāli Dictionary) —the crows are white because their bones are white, the geese are red because their blood is red<sup>2</sup>. Such arguments are there designated as being *vitandā-sallāpa-kathā*, where *sallāpa* and *kathā* together mean conversational talk, *sallāpa* being derived from *saṃ* and *lap*. According to the definitions of the *Nyāya-sūtra*, 2. 18, these would not be regarded as instances of *vitandā* but of *jāti*, i.e. inference from false analogies where there is no proper concomitance, and not *vitandā* as just explained. Rhys Davids quotes another passage from the *Sadda-nīti* of the *Aggavaṃsa* (early twelfth century) which, in his translation, runs as follows: "*Loka* means 'the common world' (*bāla-loka*). *Lokāyata* means '*āyatanti*, *ussāhanti* *vāyamanti* *vādassadenāti*'; that is, they exert themselves about it, strive about it, through the pleasure they take in discussion. Or perhaps it means 'the world does not make any effort (*yatati*) by it,' that it does not depend on it, move on by it (*na yatati na ihati vā*). For living beings (*sattā*) do not stir up their hearts (*cittaṃ na uppādentī*) by reason of that book (*taṃ hi gandhaṃ nissāya*)<sup>3</sup>." Now the *Lokāyata* is the book of the unbelievers (*titthia-sattham yaṃ loke vitandā-sattham uccati*), full of such useless disputations as the following: "All is impure; all is not impure; the crow is white, the crane is black; and for this reason or for that"—the book which is known in the world as the *vitandā-sattha*, of which the Bodhisattva, the incomparable leader, Vidhura the Pundit, said: "Follow not the *Lokāyata*, that works not for the

<sup>1</sup> *ity udāhṛtam idaṃ kathā-trayaṃ yat paraspara-vivikta-lakṣaṇam sthūlam apy anavalokya kathyate vāda eka iti śākya-śiṣyakaiḥ.*

*Nyāya-mañjarī*, p. 596.

<sup>2</sup> *Sumaṅgala-vilāsini*, I. 90, 91.

<sup>3</sup> This translation is inexact. There is no reference to any book in the Pāli passage; in the previous sentence there was a word *vādassādāna* which was translated as "through the pleasure they take in discussion," whereas the literal translation would be "by the taste (*assāda*) of the disputation," and here it means "pursuing that smell" people do not turn their minds to virtuous deeds.

progress in merit<sup>1</sup>." Thus, from the above and from many other passages from the Pāli texts it is certain that the *Lokāyata* means a kind of tricky disputation, sophistry or casuistry practised by the non-Buddhists which not only did not lead to any useful results but did not increase true wisdom and led us away from the path of Heaven and of release. The common people were fond of such tricky discourses and there was a systematic science (*śāstra* or *sattha*) dealing with this subject, despised by the Buddhists and called the *vitāṇḍa-sattha*<sup>2</sup>. *Lokāyata* is counted as a science along with other sciences in *Dīghanikāya*, III. 1. 3, and also in *Anguttara*, I. 163, and in the *Divyāvadāna* it is regarded as a special branch of study which had a *bhāṣya* and a *pravacana* (commentaries and annotations on it)<sup>3</sup>.

There seems to be a good deal of uncertainty regarding the meaning of the word *Lokāyata*. It consists of two words, *loka* and *āyata* or *ayata*; *āyata* may be derived as *ā + yam + kta* or from *ā + yat* (to make effort) + *a* either in the accusative sense or in the sense of the verb itself, and *ayata* is formed with the negative particle *a* and *yat* (to make effort). On the passage in the *Agga-vamṣa* which has already been referred to, it is derived firstly as *a + yatanti* (makes great effort) and the synonyms given are *ussāhanti vāyamanti*, and secondly as *a + yatanti*, i.e. by which people cease to make efforts (*tena loko na yatati na ihati vā lokā-yatam*). But Prof. Tucci quotes a passage from Buddhaghosa's *Sārattha-pakāsinī* where the word *āyata* is taken in the sense of

<sup>1</sup> See *Dialogues of the Buddha*, I. 168. The translation is inexact. The phrase "All is impure; all is not impure" seems to be absent in the Pāli text. The last passage quoted from *Vidhura-paṇḍita-jātaka* (Fausboll, VI, p. 286) which is one of the most ancient of the *jātakas* runs as follows: "na seve lokāyatikam na' etam paññāya vaddhanam." The unknown commentator describes the *lokāyatika* as "lokayātikam ti anattā-nissitam sagga-maggānāṃ adāyakam amīyānikam vitāṇḍa-sallāpam lokāyatika-vādam na seveyya." The *Lokāyata* leads to mischievous things and cannot lead to the path of Heaven or that of release and is only a tricky disputation which does not increase true wisdom.

<sup>2</sup> Rhys Davids seems to make a mistake in supposing that the word *Vidaddha* in *Vidaddhavādi* is only the same word as *vitāṇḍa* wrongly spelt (*Dialogues of the Buddha*, I. 167) in the *Aṭṭhasālinī*, pp. 3, 90, 92, 241. The word *vidaddha* is not *vitāṇḍa* but *vidagdha* which is entirely different from *vitāṇḍa*.

<sup>3</sup> *lokāyatam bhāṣya-pravacanam*, *Divyāvadāna*, p. 630; also *chandasi vā vyākaraṇe vā lokāyate vā pramāṇa-mīmāṃsāyām vā na cai-śam ūhā-pohah prajñāyate*. *Ibid.* p. 633.

It is true, however, that *lokāyata* is not always used in the sense of a technical logical science, but sometimes in its etymological sense (i.e. what is prevalent among the people, *lokeṣu āyato lokā-yataḥ*) as in *Divyāvadāna*, p. 619, where we find the phrase "*lokāyata-yajña-mantreṣu niṣṇātaḥ*."

āyatana (basis), and lokāyata according to this interpretation means "the basis of the foolish and profane world<sup>1</sup>." The other meaning of lokāyata would be *lokeṣu āyata*, i.e. that which is prevalent among the common people, and this meaning has been accepted by Cowell in his translation of *Sarva-darśana-saṃgraha* and here the derivation would be from *a + yam + kta* (spreading over)<sup>2</sup>. The *Amara-koṣa* only mentions the word and says that it is to be in the neuter gender as *lokāyatam*. It seems that there are two *lokāyata* words. One as adjective meaning "prevalent in the world or among the common people" and another as a technical word meaning "the science of disputation, sophistry and casuistry" (*vitandā-vāda-sattham*); but there seems to be no evidence that the word was used to mean "nature-lore," as suggested by Rhys Davids and Franke, or "polity or political science" as suggested by other scholars. The *Śukra-nīti* gives a long enumeration of the science and arts that were studied and in this it counts the *nāstika-śāstra* as that which is very strong in logical arguments and regards all things as proceeding out of their own nature and considers that there are no Vedas and no god<sup>3</sup>. Medhātithi, in commenting upon *Manu*, VII. 43, also refers to the *tarka-vidyā* of the Cārvākas, and all the older references that have been discussed show that there was a technical science of logic and sophistry called the *Lokāyata*. Fortunately we have still further conclusive evidence that the *Lokāyata-śāstra* with its commentary existed as early as the time of Kātyāyana, i.e. about 300 B.C. There is a *Vārtika* rule associated with VII. 3. 45 "*varṇaka-tāntave upasaṃkhyānam*," that the word *varṇaka* becomes *varṇakā* in the feminine to mean a blanket or a wrapper (*prāvaraṇa*), and Patañjali (about 150 B.C.), in interpreting this *vārtika sūtra*, says that the object of restricting the formation of the word *varṇaka* only to the sense of a cotton or woollen wrapper is that in other senses the feminine form would

<sup>1</sup> *Linee di una storia del Materialismo Indiano*, p. 17. *Sārattha-pakāśint* (Bangkok), II. 96.

<sup>2</sup> Rhys Davids describes *lokāyata* as a branch of Brahmanic learning, probably Nature-lore, wise sayings, riddles, rhymes and theories, handed down by tradition, as to the cosmogony, the elements, the stars, the weather, scraps of astronomy, of elementary physics, even of anatomy, and knowledge of the nature of precious stones, and of birds and beasts and plants (*Dialogues of the Buddha*, I. 171). Franke translates it as "logische beweisende Naturerklärung," *Digha*, 19.

<sup>3</sup> *yuktir vātyast yatva sarvaṃ svābhavikaṃ matam-kasyā'pi ne'svaraḥ kartā na vedo nāstikaṃ hi tat*. *Śukra-nīti-sāra*, IV. 3. 55.

be *varṇikā* or *varttikā* (e.g. meaning a commentary) as in the case of the *Bhāguri* commentary on the *Lokāyata*—*varṇikā bhāguri-lokāyatasya*, *varttikā bhāguri lokāyatasya*<sup>1</sup>. Thus it seems to be quite certain that there was a book called the *Lokāyata* on which there was at least one commentary earlier than 150 B.C. or even earlier than 300 B.C., the probable date of Kātyāyana, the author of the *vārttika-sūtra*. Probably this was the old logical work on disputation and sophistry, for no earlier text is known to us in which the *Lokāyata* is associated with materialistic doctrines as may be found in later literature, where *Cārvāka* and *Lokāyata* are identified<sup>2</sup>. Several *sūtras* are found quoted in the commentaries of Kamalaśīla, Jayanta, Prabhācandra, Guṇaratna, etc. from the seventh to the fourteenth century and these are attributed by some to *Cārvāka* by others to *Lokāyata* and by Guṇaratna (fourteenth century) to Bṛhaspati<sup>3</sup>. Kamalaśīla speaks of two different commentaries on these *sūtras* on two slightly divergent lines which correspond to the division of *dhūrta* Cārvāka and *śuśikṣita* Cārvāka in the *Nyāya-mañjarī*. Thus it seems fairly certain that there was at least one commentary on the *Lokāyata* which was probably anterior to Patañjali and Kātyāyana; and by the seventh century the *lokāyata* or the *Cārvāka-sūtras* had at least two commentaries representing two divergent schools of interpretation. In addition to this there was a work in verse attributed to Bṛhaspati, quotations from which have been utilized for the exposition of the Cārvāka system in the *Sarva-darśana-saṃgraha*. It is difficult, however, to say how and when this older science of sophistical logic or of the art of disputation became associated with materialistic theories and revolutionary doctrines of morality, and came to be hated by Buddhism, Jainism and Hinduism alike. Formerly it was hated only by the Buddhists, whereas the Brahmins are said to have learnt this science as one of the various auxiliary branches of study<sup>4</sup>.

It is well known that the cultivation of the art of disputation is very old in India. The earliest systematic treatise of this is to be found in the *Caraka-saṃhitā* (first century A.D.) which is only a

<sup>1</sup> Patañjali's *Mahā-bhāṣya* on *Pāṇini*, VII. 3. 45, and Kaiyaṭa's commentary on it.

<sup>2</sup> *tan-nāmāni cārvāka-lokāyate-ty-ādīni*. Guṇaratna's commentary on *Ṣaḍ-darśana-samuccaya*, p. 300. *Lokāyata* according to Guṇaratna means those who behave like the common undiscerning people—*lokā nirvicārāḥ sāmānya lokāḥ tadavād ācaranti sma iti lokāyatā lokāyatikā ity api*.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 307, *Tattva-saṃgraha*, p. 520.

<sup>4</sup> *Aṅguttara*, I. 163.

revision of an earlier text (*Agniveśa-saṃhitā*), which suggests the existence of such a discussion in the first or the second century B.C. if not earlier. The treatment of this art of disputation and sophistry in the *Nyāya-sūtras* is well known. Both in the *Āyur-veda* and in the *Nyāya* people made it a point to learn the sophistical modes of disputation to protect themselves from the attacks of their opponents. In the *Kathā-vatthu* also we find the practical use of this art of disputation. We hear it also spoken of as *hetu-vāda* and copious reference to it can be found in the *Mahābhārata*<sup>1</sup>. In the *Aśva-medha-parvan* of the *Mahābhārata* we hear of *hetu-vādins* (sophists or logicians) who were trying to defeat one another in logical disputes<sup>2</sup>. Perhaps the word *vākovākya* in the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, VII. 1. 2, VII. 2. 1, VII. 7. 1, also meant some art of disputation. Thus it seems almost certain that the practice of the art of disputation is very old. One other point suggested in this connection is that it is possible that the doctrine of the orthodox Hindu philosophy, that the ultimate truth can be ascertained only by an appeal to the scriptural texts, since no finality can be reached by arguments or inferences, because what may be proved by one logician may be controverted by another logician and that disproved by yet another logician, can be traced to the negative influence of the sophists or logicians who succeeded in proving theses which were disproved by others, whose findings were further contradicted by more expert logicians<sup>3</sup>. There were people who tried to refute by arguments the Vedic doctrines of the immortality of souls, the existence of a future world either as rebirth or as the *pitṛ-yāna* or the *deva-yāna*, the efficacy of the Vedic sacrifices and the like, and these logicians or sophists (*haituka*) who reviled the Vedas were called *nāstikas*. Thus, Manu says that the Brahmin who through a greater confidence in the science of logic (*hetu-śāstra*) disregards the authority of the Vedas and the *smṛti* are but *nāstikas* who should be driven out by good

<sup>1</sup> *Mahābhārata*, III. 13034, v. 1983; XIII. 789, etc.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* XIV. 85. 27.

<sup>3</sup> Compare *Brahma-sūtra* "tarkā-pratiṣṭhānād apy anyathā-numānam iti ced evam api avimokṣa-prasaṅgaḥ." II. 1. 11.

Śaṅkara also says: *yasmān nirāgamāḥ puruṣo-prekṣā-mātra-nibandhanāḥ tarkāḥ a pratiṣṭhitā bhavanti utprekṣāyāḥ nirankuṣatoḥ kair apy utprekṣitāḥ santāḥ tato'nyair ābhāsyante iti na pratiṣṭhitatvaṃ tarkānam śakyam āśrayitum*.

Vācaspati, commenting on the commentary of Śaṅkara, quotes from *Vākya-padīya*: *yatnend' numito' py arthaḥ kuṣalair anumātrbhiḥ abhiyuktatarair anyair anyathai'vo'pādīyate*.

men<sup>1</sup>. The *Bhāgavata-purāṇa* again says that one should neither follow the Vedic cult, nor be a heretic (*pāṣaṇḍī*, by which the Buddhists and Jains were meant), nor a logician (*haituka*) and take the cause of one or the other party in dry logical disputations<sup>2</sup>. Again, in *Manu*, IV. 30, it is said that one should not even speak with the heretics (*pāṣaṇḍino*), transgressors of caste disciplines (*vikarmasthān*), hypocrites (*vaiḍāla-vratika*), double-dealers and sophists (*haituka*)<sup>3</sup>. These *haitukas*, sophists or logicians thus indulged in all kinds of free discussions and controverted the Vedic doctrines. They could not be the Naiyāyikas or the Mīmāṃsists who were also sometimes called *haituka* and *tarkī* because they employed their logical reasonings in accordance with the Vedic doctrines<sup>4</sup>. Thus we reach another stage in our discussion in which we discover that the *haitukas* used sophistical reasonings not only in their discussions, but also for repudiating the Vedic, and probably also the Buddhistic doctrines, for which they were hated both by the Vedic people and the Buddhists; and thus the sophistical or logical science of disputation and criticism of Vedic or Buddhistic doctrines grew among the Brahmanic people and was cultivated by the Brahmins. This is testified by *Manu*, II. 11, where Brahmins are said to take this *hetu-sāstra*, and this also agrees with *Aṅguttara*, I. 163, and other Buddhistic texts.

But who were these *nāstikas* and were they identical with the *haitukas*? The word is irregularly formed according to Paṇini's rule, IV. 460 (*asti-nāsti-diṣṭam matih*). Patañjali, in his commentary, explains the word *āstika* as meaning one who thinks "it exists" and *nāstika* as one who thinks "it does not exist." Jayāditya, in his *Kāśikā* commentary on the above *sūtra*, explains *āstika* as one who believes in the existence of the other world (*para-loka*), *nāstika* as one who does not believe in its existence, and *diṣṭika* as one who believes only what can be logically demonstrated<sup>5</sup>. But we have the

<sup>1</sup> *yo'vamaṇyeta te mūle hetu-sāstrā-trayād dvijaḥ | sa sādhubhir vahiṣ-kāro nāstiko veda-mindakah. Manu, II. 11.*

<sup>2</sup> *veda-vāda-rato na syān na pāṣaṇḍīna haitukah | śuṣka-vāda-vivāde na hañ cit pakṣam samāśrayet. Bhāgavata, XI. 18. 30.*

<sup>3</sup> Medhatithi here describes the *haitukas* as *nāstikas*, or those who do not believe in the future world (*para-loka*) or in the sacrificial creed. Thus he says, *haitukā nāstikā nāsti paraloko, nāsti dattam, nāsti hutam ity evaṃ sthita-prajñāh.*

<sup>4</sup> *Manu, XII. 111.*

<sup>5</sup> *paralokah asti ti yasya matir asti sa āstikah, tadviparīto nāstikah; pramāṇa-mūlāni yasya matih sa diṣṭikah. Kāśikā on Paṇini, IV. 4. 60. Jayāditya lived in the first half of the seventh century.*

definition of *nāstika* in Manu's own words as one who controverts the Vedic doctrines (*veda-nindaka*<sup>1</sup>). Thus the word *nāstika* means, firstly, those who do not believe in the existence of the other world or life after death, and, secondly, those who repudiate the Vedic doctrines. These two views, however, seem to be related to each other, for a refusal to believe in the Vedic doctrines is equivalent to the denial of an after-life for the soul and also of the efficacy of the sacrifice. The *nāstika* view that there is no other life after the present one and that all consciousness ceases with death seems to be fairly well established in the Upaniṣadic period; and this view the Upaniṣads sought to refute. Thus, in the *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* Naciketa says that there are grave doubts among the people whether one does or does not exist after death, and he was extremely anxious to have a final and conclusive answer from Yama, the lord of death<sup>2</sup>. Further on Yama says that those who are blinded with greed think only of this life and do not believe in the other life and thus continually fall victims to death<sup>3</sup>. Again, in the *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (II. 4. 12, IV. 5. 13) a view is referred to by Yājñavalkya that consciousness arises from the elements of matter and vanishes along with them and that there is no consciousness after death<sup>4</sup>. Jayanta says in his *Nyāya-mañjarī* that the *Lokāyata* system was based on views expressed in passages like the above which represent only the opponent's (*pūrva-pakṣa*) view<sup>5</sup>. Jayanta further states in the same passage that no duties are prescribed in the *lokāyata*; it is only a work of tricky disputation (*vaitaṇḍika-kathai'vā'sau*) and not an *āgama*<sup>6</sup>.

References to the *nāstikas* are found also in the Buddhist litera-

<sup>1</sup> *Manu*, II. 11. Medhātithi in explaining *nāstikā'-krāntam* (*Manu*, VIII. 22) identifies *nāstikas* with *lokāyatas* who do not believe in the other world. Thus he says, *yathā nāstikair para-loka-parādhībhīr lokāyatikā'-dayair ākrāntam*. But in *Manu*, IV. 163, *nāstikya* is explained by him as meaning the view that the Vedic doctrines are false: *veda-pramāṇakānām arthānām mithyātvā-dhyavasāyasya nāstikya-śabdena pratipādanam*.

<sup>2</sup> *ye'yaṃ prete vicikitsā manuṣye astī'ty eke nā'yaṃ astī'ti ca'ke, etad-vidyām anuśiṣṭas tvayā'haṃ varāṇām eṣa varas tṛtīyah. Kaṭha*, I. 20.

<sup>3</sup> *na sāmparāyāḥ pratibhāti bālāḥ pramādy-antaṃ vitta-mohena mūḍhaḥ; ayaṃ loko nāsti para iti mānī punaḥ punaḥ vaśam āpadyate me. Ibid.* II. 6.

<sup>4</sup> *vijñāna-ghana eva etebhyaḥ bhūtebhyo samutthāya tāny evā'nvinatyati, na pretya samjñā'sti ity are bravīmi. Bṛhad-āraṇyaka*, II. 4. 12.

<sup>5</sup> *tad evaṃ pūrva-pakṣa-vacana-mūlatvāt lokāyata-śāstram api na svatantram. Nyāya-mañjarī*, p. 271, V.S. Series, 1895.

<sup>6</sup> *nahī lokāyate kiñ cit kartavyam upadīyate vaitaṇḍika-kathai'va'san na punaḥ haś cid āgamaḥ. Ibid.* p. 270.

ture. The P.T.S. Pāli Dictionary explains the meaning of the word *natthika* as one who professes the motto of "*natthi*," a sceptic, nihilist, and *natthika-diṭṭhi* as scepticism or nihilistic view. It may, however, seem desirable here to give brief accounts of some of the heretics referred to in Buddhist literature who could in some sense or other be regarded as sceptics or nihilists. Let us first take up the case of Pūraṇa Kassapa described in *Dīgha Nikāya*, II. 16, 17. Buddhaghoso, in commenting on the *Dīgha Nikāya*, I. 2, in his *Sumaṅgala-vilāsinī*, says that, in a family which had ninety-nine servants, Kassapa was the hundredth servant and he having thus completed (*pūraṇa*) the hundredth number was called by his master *pūraṇa* (the completer), and Kassapa was his family name. He fled away from the family and on the way thieves robbed him of his cloth and he somehow covered himself with grass and entered a village. But the villagers finding him naked thought him to be a great ascetic and began to treat him with respect. From that time he became an ascetic and five hundred people turned ascetics and followed him. King Ajātaśatru once went to this Pūraṇa Kassapa and asked him what was the visible reward that could be had in this life by becoming a recluse, and Pūraṇa Kassapa replied as follows: "To him who acts, O king, or causes another to act, to him who mutilates or causes another to mutilate, to him who punishes or causes another to punish, to him who causes grief or torment, to him who trembles or causes others to tremble, to him who kills a living creature, who takes what is not given, who breaks into houses, who commits dacoity, or robbery, or highway robbery, or adultery, or who speaks lies, to him thus acting there is no guilt. If with a discus with an edge sharp as a razor he should make all the living creatures on the earth one heap, one mass of flesh, there would be no guilt thence resulting, no increase of guilt would ensue. Were he to go along the south bank of the Ganges giving alms and ordering gifts to be given, offering sacrifices or causing them to be offered, there would be no merit thence resulting, no increase of merit. In generosity, in self-mastery, in control of the senses, in speaking truth, there is neither merit, nor increase of merit. Thus, Lord, did Pūraṇa Kassapa, when asked what was the immediate advantage in the life of a recluse, expound his theory of non-action (*akiriyaṃ*)<sup>1</sup>." This theory definitely repudiates the doctrine of *karma* and holds

<sup>1</sup> *Dialogues of the Buddha*, I. 69-70.

that there is neither virtue nor vice and thus no action can lead to any fruit<sup>1</sup>. This is what is here called the doctrine of *akiriya* and it is in a way an answer to the question what may be the visible reward in this life of being a recluse. Since there is neither virtue nor vice, no action can produce any meritorious or evil effect—this is one kind of *nātthikavāda*. But it is wrong to confuse this *akiriya*<sup>2</sup> doctrine with the doctrine of inactivity (*akāraka-vāda*) attributed to Sāṃkhya by Śīlāṅka in his commentary on *Sūtra-kṛtāṅga-sūtra*, I. 1. 13. That *akāraka* doctrine refers to the Sāṃkhya view that the souls do not participate in any kind of good or bad deeds<sup>3</sup>.

Let us now turn to another nihilistic teacher, viz. Ajita Keśakambalī. His doctrines are briefly described in *Dīgha*, II. 22–24, where Ajita says: “There is no such thing as alms or sacrifice or offering. There is neither fruit nor result of good or evil deeds. There is no such thing as this world or the next (*n’atthi ayaṃ loka na paro loka*). There is neither father nor mother, nor beings springing into life without them. There are in the world no recluses or Brahmins who have reached the highest point, who walk perfectly and who, having understood and realized, by themselves alone, both this world and the next, make their wisdom known to others. A human being is built up of the four elements; when he dies the earth in him returns and relapses to the earth, the fluid to the water, the heat to the fire, his wind to the air, and his faculties pass into space. The four bearers, with the bier as the fifth, take the dead body away; till they reach the burning ground men utter eulogies, but there his bones are bleached and his offerings end in ashes. It is a doctrine of fools, this talk of gifts. It is an empty lie, mere idle talk, when men say there is profit therein. Fools and wise alike, on the dissolution of the body, are cut off, annihilated and after death they are not.”<sup>4</sup> Ajita Keśakambalī was so called because he used to wear a garment made of human hair which was hot in summer and cold in winter and was thus a source of suffering.<sup>4</sup> It is easy to see that Ajita Keśakambalī’s views were very similar to

<sup>1</sup> Buddhaghoso, in commenting on it says, *sabbathāpi pāpapunānam kīriyam eva paṭikkhipati. Sumaṅgala-vīlāsī*, I. 160.

<sup>2</sup> This has been interpreted by Dr Barua as representing the doctrine of Pūraṇa Kassapa, which is evidently a blunder. *Prebuddhist Indian Philosophy*, Calcutta, 1921, p. 279.

<sup>3</sup> *bāle ca paṇḍite kāyassa bheda ucchijjanti vinassanti, na honti param maraṇā ti. Dīgha*, II. 23. *Dialogues of the Buddha*, pp. 73–74.

<sup>4</sup> *Sumaṅgala-vīlāsī*, I. 144.

the views of the Cārvākas as known to us from the fragments preserved as quotations and from accounts of them given by other people. Thus, Ajita did not believe in the other world, in virtue or vice, and denied that *karmas* produced any fruits. He, however, believed in the view that the body was made up of four elements, that there was no soul separate from the body, that with the destruction of the body everything of this life was finished, and that there was no good in the Vedic sacrifices.

Let us now turn to the doctrine of Makkhali Gosāla or Mankhali-putta Gosāla or Makkhali Gosāla who was a contemporary of the Buddha and Mahāvīra. Buddhaghoso says that he was born in a cow-shed (*go-sāla*). As he grew up he was employed as a servant; while going in the mud to bring oil he was cautioned by his master to take care not to let his feet slip (*mākhali*) in the mud; but in spite of the caution he slipped and ran away from his master, who, following him in a rage, pulled the ends of his *dhōti*, which was left in his hands, and Makkhali ran away naked. Thus left naked he afterwards became an ascetic like Pūraṇa Kassapa<sup>1</sup>. According to the *Bhagavati-sūtra*, xv. 1, however, he was the son of Makkhali who was a *mankha* (a mendicant who makes his living by showing pictures from house to house) and his mother's name was Bhaddā. He was born in a cow-shed and himself adopted the profession of a *mankha* in his youth. At his thirtieth year he met Mahāvīra and after two years he became his disciple and lived with him for six years practising penances. Then they fell out, and Makkhali Gosāla, after practising penances for two years, obtained his Jina-hood while Mahāvīra became a Jina two years after the attainment of Jina-hood by Gosāla. After this Gosāla continued to be a Jina for sixteen years and Mahāvīra met him at the end of that period in Sāvātthi where there was a quarrel between the two and Gosāla died through fever by the curse of Mahāvīra. Hoernlé shows in his edition of the text and translation of *Uvāsagadasāo*, pp. 110-111, that Mahāvīra died in 450-451 B.C. at the age of 56. Makkhali was the founder of the *Ājīvaka* sect. *Ājīvakas* are mentioned in the rock-hewn cave (which was given to them) on Barabar hills near Gaya, in the seventh Pillar Edict of Asoka in 236 B.C. and in the rock-hewn caves on Nāgārjuni hill in 227 B.C. in the reign of Asoka's successor Dāśaratha. They are also mentioned in the

<sup>1</sup> *Sumaṅgala-vilāsinī*, I. 143, 144.

*Brhaj-jātaka* (xv. 1) of Varāha Mihira in the middle of the sixth century A.D. Śilāṅka (ninth century) also refers to them in his commentary on the *Sūtra-kṛtāṅga-sūtra* (I. 1. 3. 12 and I. 3. 3. 11), in which the *Ājīvakas* are mentioned along with *Trai-rāśikas* as being followers of Makkhali Gosāla<sup>1</sup>. Halāyudha also mentions the *ājīvas* as being the same as the Jains in general; but does not distinguish the *nirgranthas* from the *Digambaras* or identify the latter with the *Ājīvakas* as Hoernlé says in his article on the *Ājīvakas*. Hoernlé further points out in the same article that in the thirteenth-century inscriptions on the walls of the Perumāl Temple at Poygai near Virinchipuram reference is made to the taxes imposed on the *Ājīvakas* by the Chola king Rājarāja in the years A.D. 1238, 1239, 1243 and 1259. Thus it is clear that the *Ājīvaka* school of Makkhali which was started by Makkhali in the fifth century B.C. continued to exist and spread not only in North India but also in South India, and other schools also have developed out of it such as the *Trai-rāśikas*. Pāṇini's grammar has a rule (IV. 1. 154), *maskara-maskarīnau veṇuparivrajakayoḥ*, which signifies that *maskara* means a bamboo and *maskarīn* a travelling ascetic. Patañjali, however, in commenting on it, says that *maskarins* were those who advised the non-performance of actions and held that cessation (*śānti*) was much better (*māśkyta karmāni śāntir vah śreyasī ityāha ato maskarī parivrajakāḥ*). The word, therefore, does not necessarily mean *ekadandins* or those who bore one bamboo staff. The identification of Makkhali with *maskarins* is therefore doubtful<sup>1</sup>. It is also very doubtful whether the *Ājīvakas* can be regarded as the same as *Digambara* Jains, as Hoernlé supposes, for neither Varāha nor Bhoṭṭolpala identifies the *Ājīvakas* with the Jains, and Śilāṅka treats them as different and not as identical<sup>2</sup>. Halāyudha also does not speak of the *Digambaras*

<sup>1</sup> The *Trai-rāśikas* are those who think that the self by good deeds becomes pure and free from *karma* and thus attains *mokṣa*, but seeing the success of its favourite doctrines it becomes joyous and seeing them neglected it becomes angry, and then being born again attains purity and freedom from *karma* by the performance of good deeds and is again born through joy and antipathy as before. Their canonical work is one containing twenty-one *sūtras*. In commenting on I. 3. 3. 11 Śilāṅka mentions also the *Digambaras* along with the *Ājīvakas*, but it does not seem that he identifies them in the way Hoernlé states in his scholarly article on the *Ājīvakas* in the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*. The exact phrase of Śilāṅka is *ājīvakā-dīnāṃ para-ārthikānāṃ digamvarānāṃ ca asad-ācāranair upaneyā*.

<sup>2</sup> Hoernlé, in his article on the *Ājīvakas* in the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, says: "From this fact that Gosāla is called Makkhaliputta or Mankhali (*Maskarīn*), i.e. the man of the bamboo staff, it is clear that originally he belonged

as *Ājīvakas*<sup>1</sup>. It is, therefore, very doubtful whether the *Ājīvakas* could be identified with the *Digambara* Jains unless by a confusion in later times, probably on account of the fact that both the *Digambaras* and the *Ājīvakas* went about naked<sup>2</sup>.

The fundamental tenet of Gośāla appears in more or less the same form in *Uvāsagadasāo*, I. 97, 115, II. 111, 132, *Samyutta Nikāya*, III. 210, *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, I. 286 and the *Dīgha Nikāya*, II. 20. In the last-mentioned work Gośāla is reported to say to king Ajātaśatru: "There is no cause for the sufferings of beings; they therefore all suffer without any cause; there is no cause for the purity (*viśuddhi*) of beings; they all become pure without any cause; there is no efficiency in one's own deeds or in the deeds of others (*n'atthi atta-kāre na'tthi parakkāre*) or in one's free efforts (*purīṣa-kāre*); there is no power, no energy, no human strength or heroic endeavours (*parākkama*)<sup>3</sup>. All vertebrates (*sabbe sattā*), all animals with one or more senses (*sabbe pāṇā*), all lives emanating from eggs or ovaries (*sabbe bhūtā*), all vegetable lives, are without any power or efficiency. They become transformed in various forms by their inherent destiny, by their manifestation in various life-forms, and by their different natures (*niyati-saṅgati-bhava-pariṇati*), and it is in accordance with their six kinds of life-states that they suffer pains and enjoy pleasures." Again, in the *Sūtra-kṛtāṅga sūtra*, II. 6. 7, Gośāla is reported to say that there is no sin for ascetics in having intercourse with women<sup>4</sup>. These doctrines of Gośāla to the class of *eka-dāṇḍins* (or *dāṇḍin*) ascetics; and, though he afterwards joined Mahāvīra and adopted his system, he held some distinguishing tenets of his own, and also retained his old distinguishing mark, the bamboo staff." This is all very doubtful, for firstly *mankha* and *maskarin* cannot be identified; secondly, *mankha* means a beggar who carried pictures in his hands—*mankha citra-phalaka-vyagrahako bhikṣuka-viśeṣaḥ* (Abhayadeva Sūri's comment on the *Bhagavati-sūtra*, p. 662. Nirṇaya Sagara ed.). Gośāla's father was a *mankha* and his name was Mankhali from which Gośāla was called Makkhaliputta. Both Jacobi (*Jaina Sūtras*, II. 267 footnote) and Hoernlé (*Ājīvaka, Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, p. 266) are here wrong, for the passage referred to is Śīlāṅka's commentary on *Sūtra-kṛtāṅga-sūtra*, III. 3. 11 (*ājivakā-dīnām para-tīrthikāṇāṃ digamvarāṇāṃ ca*), and the "ca" in the passage which is to be translated as "and" and not as "or" distinguishes the *Ājīvakas* from the *Digamvaras*.

<sup>1</sup> *nagnā ṣo dig-vāsāḥ kṣapaṇaḥ śramaṇaś ca jīvako jainah, ājivo mala-dhārt nirgranthaḥ kathyate śaḍbhūh.* II. 190.

<sup>2</sup> *Dīvyāvadāna*, p. 427, refers to an episode where a Buddha image was dishonoured by a *nirgrantha* and in consequence of that 8000 *Ājīvakas* were killed in the city of Puṇḍravardhana. Dr Barua also refers to this passage in his small work, *The Ājīvakas*.

<sup>3</sup> As Buddhaghosa says, these are all merely specifications of *purīṣa-kāra* (*savavāva purīṣa-kāra-viv'ecanam eva*). *Sumaṅgala-vīlāsini*, II. 20.

<sup>4</sup> There is another passage in the *Sūtra-kṛtāṅga-sūtra*, III. 4. 9 (*evamege u asattha paṇṇavanti anāriyā; itthivāsam gayā bālā jīnāsāna-parāṃmuḥā*), where

interest us only so far as they may be considered similar to the other *nāstika* teachings. But unlike other *nāstikas*, Gosāla believed not only in rebirths but also introduced a special doctrine of re-animation<sup>1</sup>. Several other doctrines which are not of philosophical, ethical or eschatological interest but which refer only to *Ājīvaka* dogmatics are related both in the *Digha Nikāya*, II. 20, and in the *Bhagavati-sūtra*, xv, and have been elaborately dealt with by Hoernlé in his article on the *Ājīvaka* and his translation of the *Uvāsagadasāo*. The two important points that we need take note of here are that the *Ājīvakas* who were an important sect did not believe in the efficiency of our will or our *karma* and regarded sex-indulgence as unobjectionable to recluses. Other heretics are also alluded to in the *Sūtra-kṛtāṅga sūtra*, I. III. 4. 9-14, where they also are alluded to as having similar tendencies<sup>2</sup>. Thus it is said: "Some unworthy heretics, slaves of women, ignorant men who are averse to the Law of the Jainas, speak thus: 'As the squeezing of a blister or boil causes relief for some time, so it is with (the enjoyment of) charming women. How could there be any sin in it? As a ram

it is said that some wrongdoers and others who belong to the Jaina circle have turned their faces from the laws imposed upon them by Jina and are slaves of women. Hoernlé says (*Ājīvaka, Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, p. 261) that this passage refers to the followers of Gosāla. But there is no evidence that it is so, if at least we believe in Śīlāṅka's commentary. Śīlāṅka explains "ege" or "eke" as *bauddha-viśeṣā mila-paṭṭādayaḥ nātha-vādika-maṇḍala-praviṣṭā vā śaiva-viśeṣāḥ* and *pasattha* as *sad-anuṣṭhānāt pārśve tiṣṭhanti iti parivasthāḥ* *sva-yūthyā vā pārśvathā-vasanna-kuśa-lā-dayaḥ strī-pariṣaha-parājitāḥ*. Thus, according to him, it refers to some Buddhists wearing blue garments, the *nātha-vādins*, the *Saivas*, or some Jains with bad characters, or bad people in general.

<sup>1</sup> Gosāla thought that it was possible that one person's soul could reanimate other dead bodies. Thus, when he was challenged by Mahāvīra, who forbade his disciples to hold any intercourse with him, he is reported to have said that the Makkhaliputta Gosāla who was the disciple of Mahāvīra was long dead and born in the abode of the gods while he was in reality Udāyi-kunḍiyyāyantiya, who in the seventh and the last change of body through reanimation had entered Gosāla's body. According to Gosāla, a soul must finish eighty-four thousand *mahā-kalpas* during which it must be born seven times in the abode of the gods and seven times as men, undergoing seven reanimations, exhausting all kinds of *karmas*. See *Bhagavati-sūtra*, xv. 673, Nirṇaya Sagarāed. See also Hoernlé's two Appendices to his translation of *Uvāsagadasāo* and the article on *Ājīvika, Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, p. 262. A *mahā-kalpa* is equal to 300,000 *saras* and one *sara* is the time required to exhaust the sands of the seven Ganges (each Ganges being 500 *yojanas* or 2250 miles in length, 2½ miles in breadth, and 50 *dhanus* or 100 yards in depth), at the rate of putting 100 years for the removal of one grain of sand. See *ibid.*; also Rockhill's Appendix I to his *Life of the Buddha*.

<sup>2</sup> According to Śīlāṅka they were a sect of Buddhists wearing blue garments, *Saivas*, the *Nāthas*, and some degraded Jains also.

drinks the quiet water, so it is with (the enjoyment of) charming women. How can there be any sin in it?' So say some unworthy heretics who entertain false doctrines and who long for pleasures as the ewe for her kid. Those who do not think of the future but only enjoy the present will repent of it afterwards when their life or their youth is gone<sup>1</sup>."

Again, some heretics (identified by Śīlāṅka with the *Lokāyatas*) are reported in the *Sūtra-kṛtāṅga-sūtra*, II. 1. 9-10, as instructing others as follows: Upwards from the sole of the feet up to the bottom of the tips of hair and in all transverse directions the soul is up to the skin; so long as there is the body there is the soul and there is no soul apart from this body, so the soul is identical with the body; when the body is dead there is no soul. When the body is burnt no soul is seen and all that is seen is but the white bones. When one draws a sword from a scabbard, one can say that the former lies within the latter, but one cannot say similarly of the soul that it exists in the body; there is in reality no way of distinguishing the soul from the body such that one may say that the former exists in the latter. One can draw the pith from a grass stalk, or bones from flesh or butter from curd, oil from sesamum and so forth, but it is not possible to find any such relation between the soul and the body. There is no separate soul which suffers pains and enjoys pleasures and migrates to the other world after the death of the body, for even if the body is cut into pieces no soul can be perceived, just as no soul can be perceived in a jug even when it is broken to pieces, whereas in the case of a sword it is found to be different from the scabbard within which it is put. The *Lokāyatas* thus think that there is no fault in killing living beings, since striking a living body with a weapon is like striking the ground. These *Lokāyatas*, therefore, cannot make any distinction between good and bad deeds as they do not know of any principle on which such a distinction can be made, and there is thus no morality according to them. Some slight distinction is made between the ordinary nihilists and the haughty nihilists (*pragalbha nāstika*) who say that if the soul was different from the body then it would have some specific kind of colour, taste or the like, but no such separate entity is discoverable, and therefore it cannot be believed that there is a separate soul. The *Sūtra-kṛtāṅga-sūtra*, II. 1. 9 (p. 277), speaks

<sup>1</sup> See Jacobi's translation of *Sūtra-kṛtāṅga-sūtra*. *Jaina Sūtras*, II. 270.

of these *Pragalbha Nāstikas* as renouncing (*niṣkrama*) the world and instructing other people to accept their doctrines. But Śīlāṅka says that the *Lokāyata* system has no form of initiation and thus there cannot be any ascetics of that school; it is the ascetics of other schools such as the Buddhists who sometimes in their ascetic stage read the *Lokāyata*, became converted to *lokāyata* views, and preached them to others<sup>1</sup>.

After the treatment of the views of the *lokāyata nāstikas* the *Sūtra-kṛtāṅga-sūtra* treats of the Sāṃkhyas. In this connection Śīlāṅka says that there is but little difference between the *lokāyata* and the Sāṃkhya, for though the Sāṃkhyas admit souls, these are absolutely incapable of doing any work, and all the work is done by *prakṛti* which is potentially the same as the gross elements. The body and the so-called mind is therefore nothing but the combination of the gross elements, and the admission of separate *puruṣas* is only nominal. Since such a soul cannot do anything and is of no use (*akimcītaka*), the *Lokāyatas* flatly deny them. Śīlāṅka further says that the Sāṃkhyists, like the *Lokāyatikas*, do not find anything wrong in injuring animal lives, for after all the living entities are but all material products, the so-called soul being absolutely incapable of taking interest or part in all kinds of activities<sup>2</sup>. Neither the *nāstikas* nor the Sāṃkhyists can, therefore, think of the distinction between good and bad deeds or between Heaven and Hell, and they therefore give themselves up to all kinds of enjoyments. Speaking of the *lokāyata nāstikas*, the *Sūtra-kṛtāṅga-sūtras* say as follows: "Thus some shameless men becoming monks propagate a law of their own. And others believe it, put their faith in it, adopt it (saying): 'Well you speak the truth, O Brahmana (or) O Śramaṇa, we shall present you with food, drink, spices and sweetmeats, with a robe, a bowl, or a broom.' Some have been induced to honour them, some have made (their proselytes) to honour them. Before (entering an order) they were determined to become Śramaṇas,

<sup>1</sup> *yady api lokāyatikānāṃ nāsti dīkṣādīkaṃ tathā'pi apareṇa śākyā-dīnā pravrajyā-vidhānena pravrajyā paścāt lokāyatikam adhyānasya tathāvidhā-parinateḥ tad eva'bhīrucitam*. Śīlāṅka's commentary on the *Sūtra-kṛtāṅga-sūtra*, p. 280 a (Nirṇaya Sagaraed).

In pp. 280-281 Śīlāṅka points out that the *Bhāgavatas* and other ascetics at the time of their renouncement of the world take the vow of all kinds of self-restraint, but as soon as they become converted to the *lokāyata* views they begin to live an unrestrained life. They then wear blue garments (*nīla-pāṭa*).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 281, 283.

houseless, poor monks, who would have neither sons nor cattle, to eat only what should be given them by others, and to commit no sins. After having entered their Order they do not cease (from sins), they themselves commit sins and they assent to another's committing sins. Then they are given to pleasures, amusements and sensual lust; they are greedy, fettered, passionate, covetous, the slaves of love and hate<sup>1</sup>."

But we find references to the *lokāyata* doctrines not only in the *Sūtra-kṛtāṅga-sūtra* but also in the *Bṛhad-āranyaka*, the *Kaṭha* as described above and in the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, VIII. 7, 8, where Virocana, the representative of the demons who came to Prajāpati for instruction regarding the nature of self, went away satisfied with the view that the self was identical with the body. Prajāpati asked both Indra and Virocana to stand before a cup of water and they saw their reflections, and Prajāpati told them that it was that well dressed and well adorned body that was the self and both Indra and Virocana were satisfied; but Indra was later on dissatisfied and returned for further instructions, whereas Virocana did not again come back. The *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* relates this as an old story and says that it is for this reason that those, who at the present time believe only in worldly pleasures and who have no faith (in the efficiency of deeds or in the doctrine of the immortality of the soul) and who do not perform sacrifices, are called demons (*asura*); and it is therefore their custom to adorn the dead body with fine clothes, good ornaments and provide food for it with which they probably thought that the dead would conquer the other world.

This passage of the *Chāndogya* seems to be of special importance. It shows that there was a race different from the Aryans, designated here as *asuras*, who dressed their dead bodies with fine clothes, adorned them with ornaments, provided them with food, so that when there was a resurrection of these dead bodies they might with that food, clothes and ornaments prosper in the other world and it is these people who believed that the body was the only self. The later *Lokāyatas* or *Cārvākas* also believed that this body was the self, but the difference between them and these *dehātma-vādins* referred to in the *Chāndogya* is that they admitted "another world" where the bodies rose from the dead and prospered in the fine clothes, ornaments and food that were given to

<sup>1</sup> See Jacobi, *Jaina Sūtras*, II. 341-342.

the dead body. This custom is said to be an *asura* custom. It seems possible, therefore, that probably the *lokāyata* doctrines had their beginnings in the preceding Sumerian civilization in the then prevailing customs of adorning the dead and the doctrine of bodily survival after death. This later on became so far changed that it was argued that since the self and the body were identical and since the body was burnt after death, there could not be any survival after death and hence there could not be another world after death. Already in the *Kaṭha* and the *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka* we had proof of the existence of people who did not believe in the existence of any consciousness after death and thought that everything ended with death; and in the *Chāndogya* we find that Virocana believed in the doctrine that the body was the *ātman* and this doctrine is traced here to the custom of adorning the dead body among the *asuras*.

The tenets and doctrines of these *asuras* are described in the *Gītā*, xvi. 7-18, as follows: The *asuras* cannot distinguish between right and wrong conduct; they do not have any purity, truthfulness and proper behaviour. They do not think that the world is based on any truth and reality; they do not believe in God and consider all beings to have come out from the desires of the sexes and from nothing more than from mutual sex-relations. These foolish people with such views do harm to the world, engage themselves in ferocious deeds and destroy their own selves (as they have no faith in the other world or in the means thereto)<sup>1</sup>. Full of insatiable desire, egoism, vanity and pride, they take the wrong course through ignorance and live an impure life. They think that existence ends finally at death and that there is nothing beyond this world and its enjoyments, and they therefore give themselves up to earthly enjoyments. Bound with innumerable desires, anger, attachment, etc., they busy themselves in collecting materials of earthly enjoyments through wrong means. They always think of their riches, which they earn daily, and which they accumulate, with which they fulfil their desires in the present or wish to fulfil in the future; of the enemies whom they have destroyed, or whom they wish to destroy; of their powers, their success, their joys, their strength, and so forth.

A doctrine similar to that of the *Lokāyatikas* is preached by Jābāli in *Rāmāyaṇa*, II. 108, where he says that it is a pity that there

<sup>1</sup> Śrīdhara says that these refer to the *Lokāyatikas*. *Gītā*, xvi. 9.

should be some people who prefer virtue in the other world to earthly goods of this world; the performance of the different sacrifices for the satisfaction of the dead is but waste of food, for being dead no one can eat. If food eaten by people here should be of use to other bodies, then it is better to perform *śrāddhas* for people who make a sojourn to distant countries than to arrange for their meals. Though intelligent men wrote books praising the merit of gifts, sacrifices, initiation and asceticism, in reality there is nothing more than what is directly perceived by the senses.

In the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* (1, 6. 29-31) certain people are alluded to who did not believe in the efficacy of the performance of sacrifices and spoke against the Vedas and the sacrifices; and in the *Mahābhārata*, XII. 186, it has been urged by Bharadvāja that life-functions can be explained by purely physical and physiological reasons and that the assumption of a soul is quite unnecessary. In the *Mahābhārata* references are made also to *haitukas* who did not believe in the other world; they were people with strong old convictions (*dṛḍha-pūrve*) who could hardly change their views; they were learned in the Vedas (*vahusṛuta*), were well read in older *śāstras*, made gifts, performed sacrifices, hated falsehood, were great orators in assemblies, and went among the people explaining their views. This passage reveals a curious fact that even in the Vedic circles there were people who performed sacrifices, made gifts and were well read in the Vedas and in older literature, who despised falsehood, were great logicians and speakers and yet did not believe in anything except what exists in this world (*nai'tad asti'ti-vādinah*). We know from the Buddhistic sources that the Brahmins were well versed in the *lokāyatu* learning; we know also that in the Upaniṣadic circles the views of those who did not believe in life after death are referred to and reproached, and the *Chāndogya* refers to people among whom the doctrine that the self and the body were identical was current as a corollary underlying their custom of adorning the dead. In the *Rāmāyaṇa* we find that Jāvālī taught the doctrine that there was no life after death and that the ritualistic offerings for the satisfaction of the dead were unnecessary. In the *Gītā* we find also the holders of such views referred to, and they are there reported as performing sacrifices only in name, as they did not adhere to the proper ritualistic course<sup>1</sup>. But in the

<sup>1</sup> *yajante nāma-jajñais te dambhenā'vidhi-pūrvakam. Gītā, xvi. 17.*

*Mahābhārata* certain people are referred to who were well read in the Vedas and other older literature and yet did not believe in the other world and in the immortality of the soul. This shows that this heterodox view (that there was no life after death) was gradually spreading amongst certain sections of the Vedic people, and that though some of them were worthless people who utilized the doctrine only to indulge in sense-gratifications and to live in a lower plane of life, there were others who performed the Vedic practices, were well read in Vedic and other literature and yet did not believe in the doctrine of immortality or in a world beyond the present. Thus, even in those early times, on the one hand there were in the Vedic circle many moral and learned people who believed in these heretical views, whereas there were also immoral and bad people who lived a vicious life and held such heretical views either tacitly or openly<sup>1</sup>.

We thus know that the *lokāyata* views were very old, probably as early as the Vedas, or still earlier, being current among the Sumerian people of pre-Aryan times. We know further that a commentary on the *Lokāyata-sāstra* by Bhāguri was very well known in 200 or 300 B.C., but it is exceedingly difficult to say anything regarding the author of the *Lokāyata-sāstra*. It is attributed to Bṛhaspati or to Cārvāka<sup>2</sup>. But it is difficult to say who this Bṛhaspati may have been. One *Bṛhaspati-sūtra*, a work on polity, has been edited with translation by Dr F. W. Thomas and published from Lahore. In this work the *lokāyatas* have been mentioned in II. 5, 8, 12, 16, 29, and III. 15. Here they are very severely abused as thieves who regard religion as a mere means of advantage and who are destined to go to Hell. It is therefore absolutely certain

<sup>1</sup> The *Maitrāyaṇa Upaniṣad*, VII. 8, 9, says that there are many others who by adopting useless arguments, illustrations, false analogies and illusory demonstrations wish to oppose the Vedic ways of conduct; they do not believe in the self and are like thieves who would never go to Heaven and with whom no one should associate. One sometimes forgets that the doctrine of these people is nothing new but is only a different kind of Vedic science (*veda-vidyāntaran tu tat*). Bṛhaspati became Śukra and taught the *Asuras* this doctrine so that they might be inclined to despise the Vedic duties and consider bad to be good and good to be bad.

<sup>2</sup> The *Maitrāyaṇya* attributes these doctrines to Bṛhaspati and Śukra; the *Prabodha-candro-daya* of Kṛṣṇa Miśra says that these were first formulated by Bṛhaspati and then handed over to Cārvāka who spread them among people through his pupils.

See also Mr D. Śāstri's *Cārvāka-saṁstī*, pp. 11-13, where he refers to a number of authorities who attribute this to Bṛhaspati.

that the Bṛhaspati who was the author of these *sūtras* on polity could not have been the author of the *lokāyata* science. Nor could it have been the legal writer Bṛhaspati. In Kauṭilya's *Artha-śāstra* a Bṛhaspati is referred to as a writer on polity, but this must be a different one from the *Bārhaspatya-sūtra* published by Dr Thomas<sup>1</sup>. The Bṛhaspati of Kauṭilya's *Artha-śāstra* is reported there as admitting agriculture, trade and commerce (*vārtā*), law and statecraft (*daṇḍa-nīti*), as the only sciences; in the next passage of the same chapter (*Vidyā-samuddeśa*) *daṇḍa-nīti* is regarded as the one subject of study by Uśanas. In the *Prabodha-candro-daya* Kṛṣṇa Miśra makes Cārvāka hold the view that law and statecraft are the only sciences and that the science of *vārtā* (i.e. agriculture, commerce, trade, dairy, poultry, etc.) falls within them. According to this report the Cārvākas took only *daṇḍa-nīti* and *vārtā* into account, and thus their views agreed with those of Bṛhaspati and Uśanas, and more particularly with those of the latter. But we cannot from this assume that either Bṛhaspati or Uśanas mentioned by Kauṭilya could be regarded as the author of the original *lokāyata*. Bṛhaspati, the author of the *Lokāyata-śāstra*, is thus a mythical figure, and we have practically no information regarding the originator of the *lokāyata* system. It is probable that the original *lokāyata* work was written in the form of *sūtras* which had at least two commentaries, the earliest of which was probably as early as 300 or 400 B.C. There was at least one metrical version of the main contents of this system from which extracts are found quoted in Mādhava's *Sarva-darśana-saṃgraha* and in other places.

It is difficult to say whether Cārvāka was the name of a real person or not. The earliest mention of the name is probably to be found in the *Mahābhārata*, XII. 38 and 39, where Cārvāka is described as a Rākṣasa in the garb of an ascetic Brahmin with three staffs (*tridaṇḍī*), but nothing is said there about the doctrine that he professed. In most of the early texts the *lokāyata* doctrines are either mentioned as the *lokāyata* view or attributed to Bṛhaspati. Thus, in the *Padma Purāṇa* in the *Sṛṣṭi-khaṇḍa*, XII. 318-340, some of the *lokāyata* doctrines are described as being the instructions of Bṛhaspati. Kamalaśīla, of the eighth century, refers to the Cārvākas as being the adherents of the *lokāyata* doctrine; the *Prabodha-candro-daya* speaks of Cārvāka as being the great teacher who

<sup>1</sup> Kauṭilya's *Artha-śāstra*, pp. 6, 29, 63, 177, 192, Mysore ed. 1924.

propagated through a succession of pupils and pupils of pupils the *Lokāyata-śāstra* written by Vācaspati and handed over to him. Mādhava, in his *Sarva-darśana-samgraha*, describes him as one who follows the views of Bṛhaspati and the chief of the nihilists (*bṛhaspati-matā-nusāriṇā nāstika-śiromaninā*). Guṇaratna, however, in his commentary on the *Ṣaḍ-darśana-samuccaya*, speaks of the Cārvākas as being a nihilistic sect who only eat but do not regard the existence of virtue and vice and do not trust anything else but what can be directly perceived. They drank wines and ate meat and were given to unrestricted sex-indulgence. Each year they gathered together on a particular day and had unrestricted intercourse with women. They behaved like common people and for this reason they were called *lokāyata* and because they held views originally framed by Bṛhaspati they were also called *Bārhaspatya*. Thus it is difficult to say whether the word Cārvāka was the name of a real personage or a mere allusive term applied to the adherents of the *lokāyata* view.

Both Haribhadra and Mādhava have counted the Lokāyata or Cārvāka philosophy as a *darśana* or system of philosophy. It had a new logic, a destructive criticism of most of the cherished views of other systems of Indian philosophy, a materialistic philosophy, and it denied morality, moral responsibility and religion of every kind.

Let us, therefore, first take up the Cārvāka logic. The Cārvākas admitted the validity only of perception. There is nothing else but what can be perceived by the five senses. No inference can be regarded as a valid means of knowledge, for inference is possible only when the universal concomitance of the reason (*hetus*) with the probandum is known, and such a reason is known to be existing in the object of the minor term (*vyāpti-pakṣa-dharmatā-śāli hi lingaṃ gamakam*). Such a concomitance is possible when it is known not only to be unconditional but when there is no doubt in the mind that it could be conditional. Such a concomitance must first be known before an inference is possible; but how can it be known? Not by perception, for concomitance is not an objective entity with which the senses can come in contact. Moreover, the concomitance of one entity with another means that the entities are associated with each other in the past, present and future (*sarvo-pasamhārayatṛi vyāptiḥ*), and the sense-organs can have no

scope with regard to future associations or even with regard to all past time. If it is urged that the concomitance is between the class-character (*sāmānya-gocaram*) of the probandum (e.g. fire) and the class-character of the reason (e.g. smoke), then it is not necessary that the concomitance of the reason with the probandum should have actually to be perceived at all times by the sense-organs. But if the concomitance is between the class-character of smoke and fire, why should any individual fire be associated with every case of smoke? If the concomitance cannot be perceived by the sense-organs, it cannot be perceived by the mind either, for the mind cannot associate itself with the external objects except through the sense-organs. The concomitance cannot be known through inference, for all inference presupposes it. Thus, there being no way of perceiving concomitance, inference becomes impossible. Again, a concomitance which can lead to a valid inference must be devoid of all conditions; but the absence of such conditions in the past or in the future cannot be perceived at the time of making the inference. Moreover, a condition (*upādhi*) is defined as that which, having an unfailing concomitance with the probandum, has not the same concomitance with the reason (*sādhana-vyāpakatve sati sādhyā-sama-vyāptih*)<sup>1</sup>.

Again it is said that an inference is possible only when the reason (e.g. smoke) is perceived to be associated with the object denoted by the minor term (*pakṣa*, e.g. hill), but in reality there is no association of the smoke with the hill nor can it be a character of it, for it is a quality of fire. There is no universal agreement between smoke and hill so that one can say that wherever there is a hill there is smoke. Nor can it be said that wherever there is smoke there is both the hill and the fire. When the smoke is first seen it is not perceived as the quality of fire associated with a hill; therefore it is not enough to say that the reason (e.g. smoke) belongs to the minor term (*pakṣa*, e.g. hill) as its character (*pakṣa-dharma*), but that the reason belongs to the minor term associated with the probandum. The assertion that in an inference the reason must be known as a quality of the minor term (*pakṣa*) has therefore to be interpreted as being a quality of a part of the minor term as associated with the probandum.

A valid inference can be made when the two following con-

<sup>1</sup> *Sarva-darśana-saṅgraha*, I.

ditions are satisfied: (1) An invariable and unconditional concomitance is known between the reason and the probandum such that in every case when the reason is present the probandum must also be present in all places and in all times, without the association of any determining condition. (2) That a reason having such a concomitance with the probandum must be known to exist in the minor term (*pakṣa*) in which the probandum is asserted. Now the Cārvāka contention is that none of these conditions can be fulfilled and that therefore valid inference is impossible. Firstly, concomitance is ascertained through an experience of a very large number of cases (*bhūyo-darśana*) of agreement between the reason (*hetu*) and the probandum (*sādhya*). But according to the difference of circumstances, time and place, things differ in their power or capacity and thus since the nature and qualities of things are not constant it is not possible that any two entities should be found to agree with each other under all circumstances in all times and in all places<sup>1</sup>. Again, an experience of a large number of cases cannot eliminate the possibility of a future failure of agreement. It is not possible to witness all cases of fire and smoke and thus root out all chances of a failure of their agreement, and if that were possible there would be no need of any inference<sup>2</sup>. The Cārvākas do not admit "universals," and therefore they do not admit that the concomitance is not between smoke and fire but between smoke-ness (*dhūmatva*) and fire-ness (*vahnitva*)<sup>3</sup>. Again, it is impossible to assure oneself that there are no conditions (*upādhi*) which would vitiate the concomitance between the *hetu* and the *sādhya*, for though they may not now be perceivable they may still exist imperceivably<sup>4</sup>. Without a knowledge of agreement in absence (i.e. in a case where there is no fire there is no smoke), there cannot be any assurance of concomitance. It is impossible to exhaust in

<sup>1</sup> *deśa-kāla-daśa-bheda-vicitrā-tmasu vastuṣu  
avinā-bhāva-miyamo na śakyo vastum āha ca.*

*Nyāya-mañjari*, p. 119.

<sup>2</sup> *na pratyakṣ-kṛtā yāvad dhūmā-gmī-vyaktayo' khilāḥ  
tāvat syād api dhūmo' sau yo' nagner iti śaṅkyate  
ye tu pratyakṣato viśvaṃ paśyanti hi bhavādrśaḥ  
kiṃ divya-caḥṣuṣām eṣām anumāna-prayojanam* *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *sāmānya-dvārako' py asti nā'vinābhāva-niścayaḥ  
vāstavaṃ hi na sāmānyam nāma kiñcana vidyate.* *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Compare *Khaṇḍana-khaṇḍa-khāḍya*, p. 693:  
*vyāghāto yadi śaṅkā'sti na cec chaṅkā tatatastaraṃ  
vyāghātā-vadhir āśaṅkā tarkaḥ śaṅkā-vadhiḥ kutaḥ.*

experience all cases of absence of fire as being also the cases of the absence of smoke. Thus since without such a joint method of agreement in presence and absence the universal invariable concomitance cannot be determined, and since it is not possible to assure oneself of the universal agreement in presence or in absence, the concomitance itself cannot be determined<sup>1</sup>.

Purandara, however, a follower of Cārvāka (probably of the seventh century), admits the usefulness of inference in determining the nature of all worldly things where perceptual experience is available; but inference cannot be employed for establishing any dogma regarding the transcendental world, or life after death or the laws of *Karma* which cannot be available to ordinary perceptual experience<sup>2</sup>. The main reason for upholding such a distinction between the validity of inference in our practical life of ordinary experience, and in ascertaining transcending truths beyond experience, lies in this, that an inductive generalization is made by observing a large number of cases of agreement in presence together with agreement in absence, and no cases of agreement in presence can be observed in the transcendent sphere; for even if such spheres existed they could not be perceived by the senses. Thus, since in the supposed supra-sensuous transcendent world no case of a *hetu* agreeing with the presence of its *sādhya* can be observed, no inductive generalization or law of concomitance can be made relating to this sphere<sup>3</sup>. In reply to this contention Vādideva says that such a change may be valid against the Mīmāṃsists who depend upon the joint method of agreement and difference for making any inductive generalization, but this cannot

<sup>1</sup> *niyamaś ca'numānā-ṅgaṃ gṛhitāḥ pratipadyate  
grahaṇaṃ ca'sya nā'nyatra nāstitā-mīcayāṃ vinā  
darśanā-darśanābhyāṃ hi niyama-grahaṇaṃ yadi  
tad apy asaḍ anagnau hi dhūmasye'ṣṭam adarśanam  
anagnis ca kiyaṃ sarvaṃ jagaj-jvalana-varjitam  
tatra dhūmasya nāstitvaṃ nai'va paśyanty ayogināḥ.*

*Nyāya-mañjari*, p. 120.

<sup>2</sup> He is mentioned in Kamalaśīla's *Pañjikā*, p. 431, *Purāṇaśas tv āha loha-  
prasiddham anumānaṃ cārvākair apti'syate eva, yat tu kaiś cit laukikam mārgam  
atikramya anumānaṃ ucyate tan niśidhyate.* Vādideva Sūri also quotes a *sūtra*  
of Purandara in his commentary *Syādvāda-ratnākāra* on his *Pramāṇa-naya-tattva-  
loka-lāṅkāra*, II. 131: *pramāṇasya gaunatvād anumānād artha-mīcayo durlabhāt.*

<sup>3</sup> *avyabhicārā-vagamo hi laukika-hetūnām  
anumeyā'vagame nimittaṃ sa nāsti tantra-siddheṣu  
iti na tebhyah parokṣā-rthā'vagamo nyāyī'ya' idam  
uktam anumānād artha-mīcayo durlabhāt.*

apply against the Jaina view of inference which is based on the principle of necessary implication (*anyathā-nupapattāveva tat-svarūpatvena svikārāt*).

Other objections also made against the possibility of a valid inference are as follows: (1) impressions made by inferential knowledge are dim and not so vivid (*aspaṣṭatvāt*) as those produced by perception; (2) inference has to depend on other things for the determination of its object (*svārtha-niścaye parā-pekṣatvāt*); (3) inference has to depend on perception (*pratyakṣa-pūrvakatvāt*); (4) inferential cognitions are not directly produced by the objects (*arthād anupajāyamānatvāt*); (5) inference is not concrete (*avastuviṣayatvāt*); (6) it is often found contradicted (*bādhyamānatvāt*); (7) there is no proof which may establish the law that every case of the presence of the *hetu* should also be a case of the presence of the *sādhya* (*sādhya-sādhanayoḥ pratibandha-sādhaka-pramāṇa-bhāvād vā*)<sup>1</sup>. None of these can be regarded as a reason why inference should be regarded as invalid from the Jaina point of view. For in reply to the first objection it may be pointed out that vividness has never been accepted as a definition of *pramāṇa*, and therefore its absence cannot take away the validity of an inference; illusory perceptions of two moons are vivid, but are not on that account regarded as valid. Again, an inference does not always depend on perception, and even if it did, it utilized its materials only for its own use and nothing more. Perception also is produced from certain materials, but is not on that account regarded as invalid. The inference is also produced from objects and is as concrete as perception since like it it involves universals and particulars. Again, false inferences are indeed contradicted, but that is no charge against right inferences. The invariable relationship between a *hetu* and a *sādhya* can be established through mental reasoning (*tarka*)<sup>2</sup>.

Jayanta points out in this connection that a law of universal agreement of the *sādhya* with the *hetu* has to be admitted. For an inference cannot be due to any mere instinctive flash of intelligence (*pratibhā*). If a knowledge of invariable and unconditional agreement was not regarded as indispensable for an inference, and if it was due to a mere instinctive flash, then the people of the Cocanot

<sup>1</sup> Vāḍideva Sūri's *Syādvāda-ratnākāra*, pp. 131, 132. Nirṇaya Sagara Press, 1914.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

island who do not know how to make fire would have been able to infer fire from smoke. Some say that the invariable association of the *hetu* with the *sādhya* is perceived by mental perception (*mānasa-pratyakṣa*). They hold that in perceiving the association of smoke with fire and the absence of the former when the latter is absent, the mind understands the invariable association of smoke with fire. It is not necessary in order to come to such a generalization that one should perceive the agreement of smoke and fire in all the infinite number of cases in which they exist together, for the agreement observed in the mind is not between smoke and fire but between smoke-ness and fire-ness (*jvalanatvā-di-sāmānya-puraḥsaratayā vyāpti-grahaṇāt*). The objection against this view would be the denial of class-concepts as held by the Cārvākas, Buddhists, and others. There are others, again, who say that even if universals are admitted, it is impossible that there should be universals of all cases of absence of fire as associated with the absence of smoke, and under the circumstances unless all positive and negative instances could be perceived the inductive generalization would be impossible. They, therefore, hold that there is some kind of mystic intuition like that of a yogin (*yogi-pratyakṣa-kalpam*) by which the invariable relation (*pratibandha*) is realized. Others hold that an experience of a large number of positive instances unaccompanied by any experience of any case of failure produces the notion of concomitance. But the Nyāya insists on the necessity of an experience of a large number of instances of agreement in presence and absence for arriving at any inductive generalization of concomitance<sup>1</sup>. The Cārvākas, of course, say to this that in determining the unconditional invariable agreement of every case of a *hetu* with its *sādhya* the absence of visible conditions may be realized by perception; but the possibility of the existence of invisible conditions cannot be eliminated even by the widest experience of agreement in presence, and thus there would always be the fear that the invariable concomitance of the *hetu* with the *sādhya* may be conditional, and thus all inference has the value of more or less probability but not of certainty, and it is only through perceptual corroboration that the inferences come to be regarded as valid<sup>2</sup>. The reply of Nyāya to this is that the assertion that in-

<sup>1</sup> Nyāya-mañjari, p. 122.

<sup>2</sup> *athā-numānam na pramānam yogyo-pādhanām yogyā-nupalabdhyā'bhāva-ni-caye' py' ayogyo-pādhi-śaṅkayā vyabhicāra-saṁśayāt śataśaḥ saha-caritayor api vyabhicāro-palabdheḥ ca loke dhūmā-di-darīṇā-ntaram vahnayā'di-vyavahāraś ca*

ference is not valid is itself an inference based on the similarity of inferential processes with other invalid mental processes. But this does not properly refute the Cārvāka position that inductive generalizations are only probable, and that therefore (as Purandara says) they acquire some amount of validity by being corroborated by experience and that they have no force in spheres where they cannot be corroborated by perceptual experience.

Since the Cārvākas do not attribute any more validity to inference than probability, other forms of *pramāṇas*, such as the testimony of trusty persons or the scriptures, analogy or implication, also were not regarded as valid. According to Udayana's statement, the Cārvākas denied the existence of anything that was not perceived, and Udayana points out that if this doctrine is consistently applied and people begin to disbelieve all that they do not perceive at any particular time, then all our practical life will be seriously disturbed and upset<sup>1</sup>. The school of *dhūrta Cārvākas*, in their *Sūtra* work, not only denied the validity of inference but criticized the Nyāya categories as enunciated in the *Nyāya-sūtra*, I. 1. 1, and tried to establish the view that no such enumeration of categories was possible<sup>2</sup>. It is no doubt true that the Cārvākas admitted perception as the only valid *pramāṇa*, but since illusions occurred in perception also, ultimately all *pramāṇas* were regarded as indeterminable by them.

The Cārvākas had to contend on the one hand with those who admitted a permanent soul, such as the Jains, the Naiyāyikas, the Sāṃkhya-yoga and the Mīmāṃsā, and on the other hand with the idealistic Buddhists who believed in a permanent series of conscious states; for the Cārvākas denied all kinds of existence after death. Thus they say that since there is no permanent entity that abides after death, there is no existence after death. As the body, understanding and sense-functions, are continually changing, there cannot be any existence after death, and hence no separate soul can be admitted. According to some, Cārvākas consciousness is *pro-sambhāvana-mātrāt saṃvādena ca prāmāṇyā-bhimānād. Tattva-cintāmaṇi Anumiti*. For a similar view see Russel, "On the notion of Cause" in his *Mysticism and Logic*.

<sup>1</sup> Udayana's *Nyāya-husumāñjari*, III. 5, 6.

<sup>2</sup> *cārvāka-dhūrtas tu athā'tas tattvaṃ vyākhyāsyāma iti pratijñāya pramāṇa-prameya-saṃkhyā-lakṣaṇa-niyamā-sakya-karaṇīyatvaṃ eva tattvaṃ vyākhyā-tavān; pramāṇa-saṃkhyā-niyam-āśakya-karaṇīyatva-siddhaye ca pramiti-bhedān pratyakṣā-di-pramāṇān upajanyān idrśān upādarīyāt. Nyāya-mañjari*, p. 64.

duced (*utpadyate*) from the four elements, and according to others it is manifested (*abhivyajyate*) from them like fermenting intoxication (*surā*) or acids. It is on account of diverse kinds of arrangements and rearrangements of the atoms of air, water, fire and earth that consciousness is either produced or manifested and the bodies and senses are formed or produced. There is nothing else but these atomic arrangements, and there is also no further separate category<sup>1</sup>.

The school of *Susikṣita Cārvākas* holds that, so long as the body remains, there is an entity which remains as the constant perceiver and enjoyer of all experiences. But no such thing exists after the destruction of the body. If there was anything like a permanent self that migrated from one body to another, then it would have remembered the incidents of the past life just as a man remembers the experiences of his childhood or youth<sup>2</sup>. Arguing against the Buddhist view that the series of conscious states in any life cannot be due to the last conscious state before death in a previous life, or that no state of consciousness in any life can be the cause of the series of conscious states in another future life, the Cārvākas say that no consciousness that belongs to a different body and a different series can be regarded as the cause of a different series of conscious states belonging to a different body. Like cognitions belonging to a different series, no cognition can be caused by the ultimate state of consciousness of a past body<sup>3</sup>. Again, since the last mental state of a saint cannot produce other mental states in a separate birth, it is wrong to suppose that the last mental state of a dying man should be able to produce any series of mental states in a new birth. For this reason the Cārvāka teacher Kambalāśvataṛa says that consciousness is produced from the body through the operation of the vital functions of *prāṇa*, *apāna* and other bio-motor faculties. It is also wrong to suppose that there is any dormant consciousness in the early stages of the foetal life, for consciousness means the cognition of objects, and there cannot be any consciousness in the foetal state when no sense-organs are properly developed; so also there is no consciousness in a state of swoon, and

<sup>1</sup> *tat-samudāye viṣaye-ndriya-saṃjñā. Cārvāka-sūtra* quoted in Kamalaśīla's *Pañjikā*, p. 520.

<sup>2</sup> *Nyāya-mañjarī*, p. 467.

<sup>3</sup> *yadi jñānam na tad vivakṣitā-tīta-deha-vartī-caram ajñāna-janyam. jñānatvāt yathā'nya-santāna-vartī-jñānam. Kamalaśīla's Pañjikā*, p. 521.

it is wrong to suppose that even in these stages consciousness exists as a potential power, for power presupposes something in which it exists and there is no other support for consciousness excepting the body, and, therefore, when the body is destroyed, all consciousness ceases with it. It cannot also be admitted that at death consciousness is transferred to another intermediary body, for no such body is ever perceived and cannot therefore be accepted. There cannot also be the same series of consciousness in two different bodies; thus the mental states of an elephant cannot be in the body of a horse.

The Buddhist reply to this objection of the Cārvākas is that if by discarding after-life the Cārvākas wish to repudiate the existence of any permanent entity that is born and reborn, then that is no objection to the Buddhists, for they also do not admit any such permanent soul. The Buddhist view is that there is a beginningless and endless series of states of conscious states which, taken as a period of seventy, eighty or a hundred years, is called the present, past or future life. It is wrong on the part of the Cārvākas to deny the character of this series as beginningless and endless; for if it is so admitted, then a state of consciousness at birth has to be regarded as the first and that would mean that it had no cause and it would thus be eternal, for since it existed without any cause there is no reason why it should ever cease to exist. It could not also have been produced by some eternal consciousness or god, for no such eternal entities are admitted; it cannot be admitted as being eternal by itself; it cannot be produced by eternal atoms of earth, water, etc., for it may be shown that no eternal entities can produce anything. Thus, the last alternative is that it must have been produced by the previous states of consciousness. Even if the atoms are regarded as momentary it would be difficult to prove that consciousness was produced by them. The principle which determines causation is, firstly, that something is the cause which, being present, that which was worthy of being seen but was not seen before becomes seen<sup>1</sup>. Secondly, when two instances are such that though all the other conditions are present in them both, yet with the introduction of one element there happens a new phenomenon in the one which does not happen in the other, then that element is the cause of that

<sup>1</sup> *yeṣāṃ upalambhe sati upalabdhi-lakṣaṇa-prāptiṃ pūrvam anupalabdhaṃ sad upalabhyate ity evaṃ ātrayaṇīyam. Karmalaśīla, Pañjikā, p. 525.*

phenomenon<sup>1</sup>. The two instances, which differ from each other only in this that there is the effect in the one and not in the other, agree with each other in all other respects excepting that that in which there is the effect has also a new element which is not present in the other, and it is only in such a case that that element may be regarded as the cause of that effect. Otherwise, if the cause is defined as that which being absent the effect is also absent, then there is the alternative possibility of the presence of another element which was also absent, and it might be that it was on account of the absence of this element that the effect was absent. Thus, the two instances where an effect occurs and where it does not occur must be such that they are absolutely the same in every respect, except the fact that there is one element in the case where there is the effect which was absent in the other instance. The causal relation between body and mind cannot be established by such a rigorous application of the joint method of agreement and difference. It is not possible to employ the method of agreement to determine the nature of relation between one's own body and mind, for it is not possible to observe the body in the early foetal stage before the rise of mind, for without mind there cannot be any observation. In other bodies also the mind cannot be directly observed and so it is not possible to say that the body is prior to mind. The method of difference also cannot be employed, for no one can perceive whether with the cessation of the body his mind also ceases or not; and since the minds of other people cannot be directly perceived, such a negative observation cannot be made with reference to other people, and no assertion can therefore be made as to whether with the cessation of other people's bodies their minds also ceased or not. No inference can be drawn from the immobility of the body at death that it must be due to the destruction of mind, for it may still exist and yet remain inoperative in moving the body. Moreover, the fact that a particular body is not moved by it, is due to the fact that the desires and false notions which were operative with reference to that body were then absent.

Again, there are other reasons why the body cannot be regarded as the cause of mind; for if the body as a whole was the cause of

<sup>1</sup> *saiṣu tad-anyeṣu samartheṣu ta-dhetuṣu yasyai'kasyā'bhāve na bhavati'ty evam āśrayaṇīyam anyathā hi kevalam tad-abhāve na bhavati'ty upadāśīane sandigdham atra tasya sāmāthyam syāt anyasyā'pi tat-samarthasyā'bhāvāt. Kamalaśīla, Pañjikā, p. 526.*

mind, then slight deformities of the body would have changed the character of the mind, or minds associated with big bodies like those of elephants would be greater than those of men. If with the change of one there is no change in the other, the two cannot be said to be related as cause and effect. Nor can it be said that the body with the complete set of senses is the cause of mind, for in that case with the loss of any sense the nature and character of the mind would also be changed. But we know that this is not so, and when by paralysis all the motor organs are rendered inoperative, the mind may still continue to work with unabated vigour<sup>1</sup>. Again, though the body may remain the same, yet the mental temperament, character or tone might considerably change, or sudden emotions might easily unhinge the mind though the body might remain the same. Even if instances are found which prove that the conditions of the body affect the conditions of the mind, yet that is no reason why the mind or soul should cease to exist with the destruction of the body. If on account of co-existence (*saha-sthiti-niyama*) of body and mind they may be said to be connected with each other in bonds of causation, then since body is as much co-existent with mind as mind with body, the mind may as well be said to be the cause of body. Co-existence does not prove causation, for co-existence of two things may be due to a third cause. Heated copper melts, so through heat the foetal elements may be supposed to produce on the one hand the body and on the other hand to manifest mind or consciousness. So the co-existence of body and mind does not necessarily mean that the former is the material cause of the latter.

It is said that though the later mental states are perceived to be produced by the previous ones, yet the first manifested consciousness has a beginning and it is produced by the body, and thus the theory of the Buddhists that the series of conscious states is without beginning is false. But if the mental states are in the first instance produced by the body, then these could not in later cases be produced in other ways through the visual or other sense organs. If it is urged that the body is the cause of the first origin of knowledge, but not of the later mental states, then the later mental states ought to be able to raise themselves without being in any way dependent

<sup>1</sup> *prasuptikā-ā-roḡā-dinā kārye-ndriyā-dinām upaghāte'pi mano-dhīr avī-kṛtaikā-vikalāḥ sva-sattām anubhavati*. Kamalaśīla, *Pañjikā*, p. 527.

on the body. If it is held that a mental state can produce a series of other mental states only with the help of the body, then each of them would produce an infinite series of such mental states, but such an infinite number of infinite series is never experienced. It cannot also be said that the body generates consciousness only at the first stage and that in all later stages the body remains only as an accessory cause, for that which once behaves as a generating cause cannot behave as an accessory cause. Thus, even if the physical elements be admitted to be impermanent, they cannot be regarded as the cause. If the mental states be regarded as having a beginning, it may be asked whether by mental states the sense-knowledge or the mental ideas are meant. It cannot be the former, for during sleep, swoon or inattentive conditions there is no sense-knowledge, even though the sense-organs are present, and it has therefore to be admitted that attention is the necessary pre-condition of knowledge, and the sense-organs or the sense-faculties cannot be regarded as the sole cause of sense-knowledge. The mind cannot also be regarded as the sole cause, for unless the sense-data or the sense-objects are perceived by the senses, the mind cannot work on them. If the mind could by itself know objects, then there would have been no blind or deaf people. Admitting for argument's sake that mind produces the cognitions, it may be asked whether this cognition is *savikalpa* or *nirvikalpa*; but there cannot be any *savikalpa* unless the association of names and objects (*saṅketa*) is previously learnt. It cannot be also *nirvikalpa* knowledge, for *nirvikalpa* represents the objects as they are in their unique character, which cannot be grasped by the mind alone without the help of the sense-organs. If it is held that even the sense-data are produced by the mind, then that would be the admission of extreme idealism and the giving up of the Cārvāka position. Thus, the conscious states are to be regarded as beginningless and without any origin. Their specific characters are determined by experiences of past lives, and it is as a reminiscence of these experiences that the instincts of sucking or fear show themselves even with the newly-born baby<sup>1</sup>. It has therefore to be admitted that the conscious states are produced neither by the body nor by the mind, but that they are beginningless and are generated by the previous

<sup>1</sup> *tasmāt pūrvā-bhūta-kṛta evā'yaṁ bālānām iṣṭā-miṣṭa-pādāna-parityāga-lakṣaṇo vyavahāra iti siddhā buddher anāditā. Kamalaśīla, Pañjikā, p. 53a.*

states, and these by other previous states, and so on. The parental consciousness cannot be regarded as being the cause of the consciousness of the offspring, for the latter are not similar in nature, and there are many beings which are not of parental origin. It has, therefore, to be admitted that the conscious states of this life must be produced by the states of another life previous to it. Thus, the existence of a past life is proved. And since the mental states of this life are determined by the mental states of other lives, the mental states of this life also are bound to determine other mental states, and this establishes the existence of future lives; provided, however, that these mental states are associated with the emotions of attachment, anger, antipathy, etc. For the mental states can produce other mental states only when they are affected by the emotions of attachment, anger, etc., and these are inherited by the new-born baby from the mental states of his previous life which determined the series of experiences of his present life. Though the past experiences are transferred to the present life, yet owing to a severe shock due to the intervention of the foetal period these experiences do not at once show themselves in infancy, but reveal themselves gradually with age. One does not always remember what one experienced before; thus, in dreams and deliriums, though the elements of the past experience are present, yet they are reconstructed in a distorted form and do not present themselves in the form of memory. So the past experiences cannot ordinarily be remembered by the infant, though there are some gifted beings who can remember their past lives. It is wrong to suppose that the mind is supported by the body or inheres in it, for the mind is formless. Again, if the mind inhered in the body and was of the same stuff as the body, then the mental states should be as perceptible by the visual organ as the body itself. The mental states can be perceived only by the mind in which they occur, but the body can be perceived both by that mind as well as by others; therefore, these two are of entirely different character and are hence entirely different. The body is continually changing, and it is the unitary series of conscious states that produces the impression of the identity of the body. For though the individual consciousnesses are being destroyed every moment, yet the series remains one in its continuity in the past lives, the present life and the future. When the series is different, as in that of a cow and a horse or between two different

persons, the states of the one series cannot affect those in the other. One conscious state is thus admitted to be determining another conscious state, and that another, and so on, within the series. Thus it has to be admitted that consciousness exists, even in the unconscious state; for had it not been so, then there would be a lapse of consciousness at that time and this would mean the breaking up of the series. States of consciousness are independent of the sense-organs and the sense-objects, as they are determined by the previous states; in dreams, when the sense-organs are not operating and when there is no sense-object contact, the conscious states continue to be produced; and in the case of the knowledge of past or future events, or the knowledge of chimerical things like the hare's horn, the independence of conscious states is clearly demonstrated. Thus it is proved that consciousness is neither produced by the body nor is in any way determined or conditioned by it, and it is determined only by its past states and itself determines the future states. Thus also the existence of the past and the future lives is proved.

The arguments of the Jains and of the Naiyāyikas against the Cārvākas are somewhat of a different nature from those of the idealistic Buddhists just described, as the former admitted permanent souls which the latter denied. Thus Vidyānandi, in his *Tattvārtha-śloka-vārtika*, says that the chief reason why the soul cannot be regarded as a product of matter is the fact of undisputed, unintermittent and universal self-consciousness unlimited by time or space. Such perceptions as "this is blue" or "I am white" depend upon external objects or the sense-organs, and cannot therefore be regarded as typical cases of self-consciousness. But such perceptions as "I am happy" which directly refer to the self-perception of the ego do not depend on the operation of any external instruments such as the sense-organs or the like. If this self-consciousness were not admitted to be established by itself, no other doctrine, not even the Cārvāka doctrine which seeks to demolish all attested convictions, could be asserted, for all assertions are made by virtue of this self-consciousness. If any consciousness required another consciousness to have itself attested, then that would involve a vicious infinite and the first consciousness would have to be admitted as unconscious. Thus, since the self manifests itself in self-consciousness (*sva-samvedana*), and since the body is perceived

through the operation of the senses like all other physical things, the former is entirely different from the latter and cannot be produced by the latter, and because it is eternal it cannot also be manifested by the latter. Again, since consciousness exists even without the senses, and since it may not exist even when there is the body and the senses (as in a dead body), the consciousness cannot be regarded as depending on the body. Thus, the self is directly known as different from the body by the testimony of self-consciousness. The other arguments of Vidyānandi are directed against the idealistic Buddhists who do not believe in a permanent self but believe in the beginningless series of conscious states, and this discussion had better be omitted here<sup>1</sup>.

Jayanta argues in the *Nyāya-mañjarī* that the body is continually changing from infancy to old age, and therefore the experiences of one body cannot belong to the new body that has been formed through growth or decay, and therefore the identity of the ego and recognition which form the essential constitutive elements of knowledge cannot belong to the body<sup>2</sup>. It is true no doubt that good diet and medicine which are helpful to the body are also helpful to the proper functioning of the intellect. It is also true that curds and vegetable products and damp places soon begin to germinate into insects. But this is no proof that matter is the cause of consciousness. The selves are all-pervading, and when there is appropriate modifications of physical elements they manifest themselves through them according to the conditions of their own *karmas*. Again, consciousness cannot also be admitted to belong to the senses, for apart from the diverse sense-cognitions there is the apperception of the ego or the self which co-ordinates these diverse sense-cognitions. Thus I feel that whatever I perceive by the eyes I touch by the hand, which shows distinctly that apart from the sense-cognitions there is the individual perceiver or the ego who co-ordinates these sensations, and without such a co-ordinator the unity of the different sensations could not be attained. The *Suśikṣita Cārvākas*, however, hold that there is one perceiver so long as the body exists, but that this perceiver (*pramātṛ-tattva*) does not transmigrate, but is destroyed with the destruction of the body; the soul is thus not immortal, and there is no after-world after the destruction of this body<sup>3</sup>. To this Jayanta's reply is that if

<sup>1</sup> *Tattvārtha-śloka-vārtika*, pp. 26-52.

<sup>2</sup> *Nyāya-mañjarī*, pp. 439-441.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 467, 468.

a self is admitted to exist during the lifetime of this body, then since this self is different from the body, and since it is partless and non-physical by nature, there cannot be anything which can destroy it. No one has ever perceived the self to be burnt or torn to pieces by birds or animals as a dead body can be. Thus, since it has never been found to be destroyed, and since it is not possible to infer any cause which can destroy it, it is to be regarded as immortal. Since the self is eternal, and since it has a present and past association with a body, it is not difficult to prove that it will have also a future association with a body. Thus, self does not reside either in any part of the body or throughout the body, but is all-pervading and behaves as the possessor of that body with which it becomes associated through the bonds of *karma*. *Para-loka* or after-life is defined by Jayanta as rebirth or the association of the soul with other bodies after death. The proofs that are adduced in favour of such rebirths are, firstly, from the instinctive behaviour of infants in sucking the mother's breast or from their unaccountable joys and miseries which are supposed to be due to the memory of their past experiences in another birth; and, secondly, from the inequalities of powers, intelligence, temper, character and habits, inequalities in the reaping of fruits from the same kind of efforts. These can be explained only on the supposition of the effects of *karma* performed in other births<sup>1</sup>.

Śaṅkara, in interpreting the *Brahma-sūtra*, III. 3. 53, 54, tries to refute the *lokayatika* doctrine of soullessness. The main points in the *lokayatika* argument here described are that since consciousness exists only when there is a body, and does not exist when there is no body, this consciousness must be a product of the body. Life-movements, consciousness, memory and other intellectual functions also belong to the body, since they are experienced only in the body and not outside of it<sup>2</sup>. To this Śaṅkara's reply is that life-movements, memory, etc., do not sometimes exist even when the body exists (at death), therefore they cannot be the products of the body. The qualities of the body, such as colour, form, etc., can be

<sup>1</sup> *Nyāya-mañjari*, pp. 470-473.

<sup>2</sup> *yad dhi yasmin sati bhavaty asati ca na bhavati tat tad-dharmatvena adhyavasyate yathā'gmi-dharmāu auṣṭhya-prakāśau; prāṇa-ceṣṭā-caitanya-smṛtyā-dayāś cā'tma-dharmatvenā'bhimatā ātma-vā-dinām te' py antar eva deha upalābhyamānā bahiś cā'nupalabhyamānā asiddhe deha-vyat irikte dharmiṇi deha-dharmā eva bhavitum arhanti; tasmād avyatiṛeko dehād ātmāna iti. Śaṅkara-bhāṣya on Brahma-sūtra, III. 3. 53.*

perceived by everyone, but there are some who cannot perceive consciousness, memory, etc. Again, though these are perceived so long as the living body exists, yet there is no proof that it does not exist when this body is destroyed. Further, if consciousness is a product of the body, it could not grasp the body; no fire can burn itself and no dancer can mount his own shoulders. Consciousness is always one and unchangeable and is therefore to be regarded as the immortal self. Though ordinarily the self is found to manifest itself in association with a body, that only shows that the body is its instrument, but it does not prove that the self is the product of the body, as is contended by the Cārvākas. The Cārvākas criticized the entire social, moral and religious programme of orthodox Hindus. Thus Śrīharṣa, in representing their views in his *Naiṣadha-carita*, says as follows: "The scriptural view that the performance of sacrifices produces wonderful results is directly contradicted by experience, and is as false as the Purāṇic story of the floating of stones. It is only those who are devoid of wisdom and capacity for work who earn a livelihood by the Vedic sacrifices, or the carrying of three sticks (*tridaṇḍa*), or the besmearing of the forehead with ashes. There is no certainty of the purity of castes, for, considering the irrepressible sex-emotions of men and women, it is impossible to say that any particular lineage has been kept pure throughout its history in the many families on its maternal and paternal sides. Men are not particular in keeping themselves pure, and the reason why they are so keen to keep the women in the harem is nothing but jealousy; it is unjustifiable to think that unbridled sex-indulgence brings any sin or that sins bring suffering and virtues happiness in another birth; for who knows what will happen in the other birth when in this life we often see that sinful men prosper and virtuous people suffer?" The Vedic and the *smṛti* texts are continually coming into conflict with one another, and are reconciled only by the trickery of the commentators; if that is so, why not accept a view in which one may act as one pleases? It is held that the sense of ego is associated with the body, but when this body is burnt, what remains there of virtue or vice, and even if there is anything that will be experienced by another ego and in another body and as such that cannot hurt me. It is ridiculous to suppose that any one should remember anything after death, or that after death the fruits of *karma* will be reaped, or that by feeding Brahmins after death the so-called departed soul will have any

satisfaction. The image-worship, or the worship of stones with flowers, or of bathing in the Ganges as a religious practice is absolutely ridiculous. The practice of performing *śrāddha* ceremonies for the satisfaction of the departed is useless, for if the offering of food could satisfy the dead then the hunger of travellers could also be removed by their relations offering them food at home. In reality with death and destruction of the body everything ends, for nothing returns when the body is reduced to ashes. Since there is no soul, no rebirth, no god and no after-life, and since all the scriptures are but the instructions of priests interested in cheating the people, and the Purāṇas are but false mythical accounts and fanciful stories, the one ideal of our conduct is nothing but sense-pleasures. Sins and virtues have no meaning, they are only the words with which people are scared to behave in a particular manner advantageous to the priests. In the field of metaphysics the Cārvākas are materialists and believe in nothing beyond the purely sensible elements of the atoms of earth, water, air and fire and their combinations; in the field of logic they believe in nothing but what can be directly perceived; they deny *karma*, fruits of *karma*, rebirth or souls. The only thing that the Cārvākas cared for was the momentary sense-pleasures, unrestrained enjoyment of sensual joys. They did not believe in sacrificing present joys to obtain happiness in the future, they did not aim at increasing the total happiness and well-being of the whole life as we find in the ethical scheme of Caraka; with them a pigeon to-day was better than a peacock to-morrow, better to have a sure copper coin to-day than a doubtful gold coin in the future<sup>1</sup>. Thus, immediate sense-pleasures were all that they wanted and any display of prudence, restraint, or other considerations which might lead to the sacrifice of present pleasures was regarded by them as foolish and unwise. It does not seem that there was any element of pessimism in their doctrine. Their whole ethical position followed from their general metaphysical and logical doctrine that sense-objects or sense-pleasures were all that existed, that there was no supra-sensible or transcendent reality, and thus there was no gradation or qualitative difference between the pleasures and no reason why any restraint should be put upon our normal tendency to indulge in sense-pleasures.

<sup>1</sup>

*varam adya kapotaḥ tva mayūrāt  
varam samśrayikān niṣkād asaṁśrayikāḥ  
kārṣāṇa iti lokāyatikāḥ.*

*Kāma-sūtra*, 1. 2. 29, 30.

# INDEX<sup>1</sup>

- Abhayadeva Sūri, 524 n.  
 Abhaya-prada-rāja, 134  
*Abhaya-pradāna-sāra*, 124  
*abhāva*, 351, 428  
*abheda*, 6, 194, 373  
*Abhidhāna-padīpikā*, 512 n.  
*abhihitā-nvaya-vāda*, 233  
*abhimāna*, 48, 468, 485, 494, 510  
*abhimantā*, 48  
*abhiniveśa*, 470  
*abhinna*, 32  
 Abhirāma Varācārya, 69, 134, 138  
 Abhirāma Varādhīśa, 111  
*Abhiti-stava*, 121  
*abhiyayakti*, 387  
 Ablative case, 391  
 Ablutions, 22  
 Abnegation, 99  
 Abode, 52  
 Absence, 203; of cruelty, 29; of greed, 61; of obstruction, 280  
 Absolute, 41, 52, 398, 405, 474, 475; coincidence, 230; idealism, 358; immortality, 383; trustfulness, 91  
 Absolute surrender, 91  
 Absorption, 195  
 Abstract, 356  
 Absurd, 230 n.  
 Acceptance, 54  
 Accessory, 24, 37, 90, 124, 205, 259, 261, 273, 292, 310, 330, 331, 387, 444, 452; agent, 272, 275; cause, 544; collocations, 354; methods, 380 n.  
 Accordance, 54  
*acic-chakti*, 416  
*acidamśa*, 301  
*acit*, 89, 160, 391, 396, 397; Venkṭa's view of, 162 et seq.  
*acit-saṃsarga*, 383  
 Acquaintance, 321, 460  
 Act, 205, 520  
 Actions, 7, 11, 16, 28, 31, 32, 41, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 129, 186, 187, 198, 212 n., 290, 294, 295, 300, 303, 304, 318, 349, 414, 441, 451, 452, 455, 485, 493, 506, 508, 521, 523  
 Active, 48; operation, 203; sense, 49; sympathy, 90  
 Activity, 27, 36, 42, 44, 47, 50, 51, 413, 446, 447, 448 n., 452, 462, 465, 481, 492, 493, 497, 509  
 Actual perception, 185 n., 313  
 Actual state, 37  
 Acyuta, 27, 29  
*adharma*, 153, 349, 453, 503  
*adhigatārtha-gaṇī*, 216  
*adhikaraṇa*, 352  
*Adhikaraṇa-cintāmaṇi*, 93 n., 123, 125  
*Adhikaraṇa-darpaṇa*, 123  
*Adhikaraṇa-sārārtha-dīpikā*, 117, 118  
*Adhikaraṇa-sārāvallī*, 118, 123, 125  
*Adhikaraṇa-sārāvallī-vyākhyā*, 123  
*Adhikaraṇa-yukti-vilāsa*, 118  
*Adhikāra-cintāmaṇi*, 118  
*Adhikāra-saṃgraha-vyākhyā*, 127  
*adhiṣṭhāna*, 408, 422, 423, 439, 456  
*adhiṣṭhāna-kāraṇa*, 47, 365, 454, 456, 478, 493  
*adhiṣṭhāna-kāraṇatā*, 484  
*adhiṣṭhātṛtva*, 498  
*adhīta-prabandhaḥ prapannaḥ*, 91  
*Adhvaranāyikā*, 114 n., 125  
*adhyavasāya*, 504  
*Adhyātma-cintā*, 132  
*Adhyātma-cintāmaṇi*, 135  
*Ad infinitum*, 332, 417  
 Adjectival qualities, 254  
 Adjuncts, 303  
 Admission, 339  
 Admixture, 38  
 Adoration, 53, 54, 55, 70, 450  
*a-dravya*, 225, 251  
*adr̥ṣṭa*, 152, 164, 189, 292, 303, 444, 479; Venkṭa's view of, 303-4  
*advaita*, 4, 416  
*Advaita-kāmadhenu*, 396 n.  
*Advaita-siddhi*, 133  
*Advaita-vaiṣṭkāra*, 132  
*Advaita-vana-kuṭhāra*, 115 n., 384  
*Advaita-vidyā-vijaya*, 126  
*Advaita-vijaya*, 361  
 Advaitic, 65  
 Advaitins, 129, 142, 295  
 Affection, 70, 292  
 Affinity, 466, 471  
 Affirmation, 193, 211, 419  
 Afflictions, 28, 44, 454

<sup>1</sup> The words are arranged in the order of the English alphabet. Sanskrit and Pāli technical terms and words are in small italics; names of books are in italics with a capital. English words and other names are in Roman with a capital. Letters with diacritical marks come after ordinary ones.

- After-life, 541, 548  
*Agastya-saṃhitā*, 23  
 Agency, 35, 172, 198, 412, 484, 488  
 Agent, 8, 11, 27, 31, 204, 290, 407, 412, 477, 486, 500  
 Aggavaṃsa, 513, 514  
 Agglutinative, 45  
 Aggregation, 287  
 Agni, 505, 508  
*Agni-purāṇa*, 20  
*Agniveśa-saṃhitā*, 517  
 Agreement, 296, 344, 372, 535, 536  
*aḥam-artha*, 173, 425  
*aḥam anubhavāmi*, 171  
*aḥamkāra*, 7, 25, 43, 47, 48, 49, 56, 91, 144, 145, 146, 156, 163, 172, 173, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260 n., 280, 490, 499, 504, 507, 508, 510, 511; its nature, 171-3; Nimbārka's conception of, 411 *et seq.*  
*aḥamkāra-vaikārika*, 510  
*aḥam-pratyaya-vedya*, 443  
*ahimsā*, 61  
*Ahimbudhnyā*, 24, 34, 50, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 379, 503 n.  
*Ahimbudhnyā-saṃhitā*, 21, 24, 34, 36 n., 37 n., 39, 40 n., 41, 42, 43 n., 44 n., 46 n., 47 n., 48 n., 49 n., 50 n., 51 n., 52 n., 53 n., 54, 55 n., 56 n., 57 n., 58 n., 59 n., 60 n., 62 n., 379, 448 n.; accessories of Yoga in, 61; adoration in, 54; anatomy in, 59; *antaryāmin* doctrine of, 41; *avatāras* in, 38-9; *āsana* in, 60; Brahman, nature of, in, 35; Brahman, followers of, in, 35; developments of *aḥamkāra* in, 48; *dharma* and *jñāna*, classification of, in, 62; emancipation in, 62; faith in, 54; God's grace in, 52; God, how to approach Him, in, 53; God's *līlā* in, 51; God, power of, different views of, in, 57; God, qualities of, in, 56; God, relation with *jīva*, in 50; *guṇas*, mutual partial similarity of, in, 46 n.; impure creations in, 42 *et seq.*; intermediate creation in, 42; *jīva* as *taṣastha-śakti*, 50 and 50 n.; *jīva*'s emancipation in, 52; *jīva*'s nature of, in, 51; *jīva*'s, relation of God with, in, 51; *kāla* and *niyati* in, 45; Lakṣmī as *māyā* in, 52; Lakṣmī as *śakti* in, 52; Lakṣmī, nature of, in, 52; *mahat*, development in, 47; *mahat* in, 47; man, fall of, in, 50; *manus* and *mānavas* in, 49; *mukti*, states of, in 56; nature of souls, in 61; *nyāsa* and *saraṇāgati* in, 55; objects of *pramāṇas* in, 62; *pramā* and *pramāṇa*, definition of, in, 62; *prapatti* in, 54; *puruṣa* in, 43; *puruṣa* and *avidyā* in, 44; Saṃkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Anirudha in, 56; *sattva*, *rajas* and *taṃas* in, 45; senses and personality, evolution of, in, 49; service of God in, 54; Sudarśana power, nature of, in, 53; Sudarśana power of, in, 57; *śabda-brahman*, evolution of, in, 58; *śabda*-energy and the *cakras* in, 58; *śakti* and creation in, 36-7; *śakti*, nature of, in, 36; *śakti* of God in, 44; time in, 46; time in relation with categories, in, 46; trinity of *prakṛti*, *puruṣa* and *kāla*, in, 46-7; ultimate reality in, 34; ultimate reality, realization of, in, 34; *upāya-jñāna* in, 55; *vāsanā*, *karma* affecting the *jīvas*, in, 51; Viṣṇu-*śakti* as *bhāvaka* and *bhāvya* in, 50; *vyūhas* in, 38; *vyūha* doctrine in, 39; *yamas* and *niyamas*, enumeration of, in, 61; *yoga* in, 60  
 Ahobila, 123  
 Ahobila Raṅgaṇāthīa Yati, 118, 131  
 Air, 60, 128, 499, 504, 540, 550  
*aiśvarya*, 30, 35, 37, 47, 56  
*aitihya*, 426  
 Aiyangar, Mr S. K., 64 n., 66, 67 n., 68, 81 n., 104 n.  
*ajāda*, 146, 171  
*ajādatva*, 171  
 Ajātaśatru, 520, 524  
 Ajita, 521, 522  
 Ajita Keśakambali, 521; his doctrines, 521  
 Ajmir, 103  
 Ajñāna, 144, 177, 178, 179, 195, 315, 317, 321, 327, 328, 329, 330, 338, 339, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 374, 393, 394, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 424, 426, 437, 439, 466, 470, 485, 487, 495, 506; characteristics, 365; constituents, 367; diverse supposition of it refuted by Rāmānuja, 177 *et seq.*; its assumption leads to vicious infinity, 177 n.; its criticism by Veṅkaṭa, 327 *et seq.*; Nimbārka's conception of, 407 *et seq.*; refuted by Rāmānuja, 177; stuff, 366; Saṅkara's view of it criticized by Mahācārya, 361 *et seq.*; Sāṅkarite view criticized by Mādhava Mukunda, 424 *et seq.*; unspeakable, 367; whole, 372

- ajñātatayā jñātatayai'va*, 249  
*akāla*, 447  
*akāraka-vāda*, 521  
*Akhaṇḍārthatva-bhaṅga*, 126  
*akhyāti*, 47, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 237, 239, 241, 243, 245; view, 186 n., 244, 245  
*akimcītkara*, 527  
*akiriya*, 521  
*akiriyam*, 520  
*Akkaialvan*, 97 n.  
*akṣara*, 46, 503  
*alambuṣa*, 59  
*alarka-śāka*, 97 n.  
*alaukika*, 426  
*'Alā-ud-dīn*, 120  
*Allahabad*, 101, 401 n.  
*All-complete*, 303  
*All-illuminating*, 451  
*All-merciful*, 85, 99, 412  
*All-perceiving*, 27  
*All-pervading*, 393, 405, 413  
*All-pervasive*, 23, 24, 262, 291, 292, 299, 426, 432; entities, 263  
*All-pervasiveness*, 157, 450  
*Allegorical drama*, 121  
*Alms*, 102, 119  
*alpa*, 292  
*Alternative*, 180, 207, 209, 210, 312, 430  
*Aṣṭārkoil*, 103  
*Analan-ādiṭṭhān*, 69, 134 n.  
*Amara-koṣa*, 515  
*Ambrosial sweetness*, 84  
*Ammaṅgi*, 105  
*Amorous*, 73; longings, 83  
*amṛta*, 502  
*amumtila*, 505  
*aṁśa*, 194, 485  
*aṁśā-śābhaṅga*, 484  
*aṁśāvatāra*, 475  
*an-adhigatā-rīta-gaṇṭh*, 215  
*an-adhyavasāya*, 214  
*Analogy*, 5, 128, 144, 192, 216, 219, 230, 269, 276, 298, 301, 315, 322, 341, 371, 410, 434, 452, 455, 469, 512, 513, 531 n., 539  
*Analysis*, 52, 180, 207, 297  
*Analytic*, 31  
*Analytical*, 497  
*Ananda Press*, 94 n.  
*Ananta*, 39 n., 351  
*Ananta Bhaṭṭa*, 98, 102  
*Ananta Dīkṣita*, 98, 162 n.  
*Anantaguru*, 112  
*Anantarāma*, 408, 409, 410; his criticism of the *māyā* of Śaṅkara, 410 *et seq.*  
*Ananta-sūri*, 94 n., 98 n., 110, 119  
*Anantācārya*, 98, 105, 188, 241, 242 n., 246, 247, 305; supports correspondence theory, 246-7; theory of illusion, 188  
*Anantārya*, 102, 110, 112, 131, 133, 209, 297, 298, 395; his notion of class-concepts, 297; his view of relations of souls with God, 297  
*an-anubhāvvyatva*, 230, 231  
*an-anyathā-siddhatva*, 390  
*an-anyathā-siddha-miyata-pūrva-vartitā*, 397  
*Anatomy*, 515 n.  
*anauṣādhika*, 485  
*anavadhāraṇa*, 369  
*anavadhāraṇatvam eva āvaraṇam*, 370  
*anavasthā*, 9, 176  
*anavasthā-parihārāya*, 249  
*anādy-ananta*, 61  
*a-nāmaka*, 25  
*andhatāmisa*, 500  
*Andhrapūrṇa*, 104, 105, 109  
*aneka-dharma*, 212  
*anekānta*, 210  
*Anger*, 32, 48, 61, 545  
*Animals*, 221, 441 n.  
*Animate*, 116  
*Aniruddha*, 13, 37, 38, 39, 42, 43, 44, 52, 56, 57, 157, 158, 443 n., 448 n., 475  
*Aniruddha-saṁhitā-mahopaniṣad*, 23  
*anirvacanīya*, 179, 238, 239, 243, 435  
*anirvacanīya-khyāti*, 183, 188, 242, 245  
*amityatva*, 199  
*anīyama*, 227  
*Annihilation*, 276, 324, 377  
*Antagonism*, 437  
*Antagonistic*, 374  
*antah*, 483  
*antahkaraṇa*, 142, 152, 172, 173, 361, 364, 366, 368, 369, 370, 420, 434, 444, 453, 486, 499 n.  
*antahkaraṇa-vṛtti*, 411  
*antarāṅga*, 377  
*antaryāmi*, 483  
*antaryāmy-avatāra*, 39 n.  
*Antaryāmi-brahmaṇa*, 390  
*antaryāmin*, 40, 41, 200  
*Antecedent*, 203, 342  
*Antipathy*, 29, 30, 51, 87, 148, 449, 470, 488  
*Antiquity*, 99  
*anubhava*, 8, 9  
*anubhāvā-numāna*, 229  
*anubhāvya*, 231  
*anubhūti*, 143, 168, 170, 171, 177, 230 n., 231, 318, 348

- anugraha*, 51, 52  
*anugrahasarga*, 502  
*anumāna*, 426, 427, 487  
*anumiti*, 178 n.  
*anupalabdhī*, 426, 428  
*anūsāsana parva*, 447  
*anuvṛtti*, 224  
*anuvṛtti-viśayaḥ*, 224  
*anuvṛtti-aviśayasaya-jñāna*, 224  
*anu-vyavasāya*, 467  
*anvaya*, 231  
*anvaya-vyatiṛeki*, 227, 228, 229, 427  
*Anvayārtha-prakāśikā*, 197 n.  
*Anvayārya*, 384  
*Anvayārya Dikṣita*, 384  
*anvīta-bhidhāna*, 233; Venkaṭa, its upholder, 233  
*anvīta-bhidhāna-vāda*, 233  
*anyathā-jñāna*, 485  
*anyathā-khṛvāṇi*, 179, 180, 181, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 210, 237, 239, 241, 242, 244, 245, 398  
*anyathāvabhāsaḥ*, 179  
*anvayai*, 229  
*anyonya-bhāva*, 428  
*anyonyā-śraya*, 329  
*anyūnānatirikta*, 46  
*Āṅgirā*, 482  
*Āṅguttara Nikāya*, 516 n, 518, 524  
*Āñjali-vaiḥbhava*, 127  
*Āṇḍa-guru*, 115  
*Āṇḍavāyyaṅgācārya*, 133  
*Āṇḍācārya*, 111, 137  
*Āṇḍayārya*, 115, 130, 132, 133, 396  
*anu*, 498  
*ap*, 49 n.  
*apara*, 489  
*aparā*, 509  
*aparigraha*, 61 n.  
*aparokṣa*, 227, 367, 442  
*Aparyātmamṛtācārya*, 112  
*Apathy*, 73  
*apavarga*, 506  
*apāna*, 59, 540  
*apāna vāyu*, 59  
*apāramārthikā*, 477  
*Aperture*, 59  
*Apostolic*, 66  
*Appayācārya*, 122  
*Apvaya-dikṣita*, 114, 116, 121, 131, 133  
*Appeal*, 56  
*Appearance*, 52, 179, 180, 182, 187, 188, 193, 196, 199, 207, 218, 268, 290, 306, 325, 332, 333, 336, 337, 366, 367, 369, 407, 422, 471  
*Apperception*, 80, 368, 465  
*Apprehension*, 177, 183, 186, 215, 219, 239  
*apramāṇa*, 247  
*aprameyatva*, 230 n.  
*apavṛttimat*, 46  
*aprākṛta-vapuḥ*, 73  
*a-prāmāṇya*, 202  
*apṛthak-siddha*, 299  
*a-pṛthak-sthita*, 35  
*apūrva*, 303, 506  
*apūrvavidhī*, 405 n.  
*arcavatāra*, 39 n., 41  
*Arcir-ādī*, 135 n.  
*Argument*, 124, 184, 190, 289, 291, 313, 314, 503, 512, 513, 517, 546, 547; in a circle, 17  
*ariṣṭa*, 506 n.  
*Arjuna*, 39, 158  
*artha*, 62  
*artha-kriyā-kāritva*, 436, 458  
*Artha-pañcaka*, 135 n.  
*artha-paricchedaka*, 240  
*artha-pariccheda-kāri*, 240  
*arthāpatti*, 128, 234, 235, 314, 426; upheld by Meghanādāri, 234-5  
*artha-prakāśa*, 356  
*Artha-śāstra*, 512, 532  
*Articles of worship*, 70  
*Arunaghaṭi*, 416  
*Arunādhikaraṇa-śaraṇa-vivaraṇi*, 392  
*arvāksrotas*, 501, 502  
*Aṣṭagiyas*, 68, 85, 88, 89, 94, 105, 138  
*asamavāyi*, 456  
*asamprajñāta*, 488  
*asamprajñāta-samādhi*, 446, 487  
*asamprajñāta yoga*, 446  
*asamsargāgraha*, 186  
*asaṅga*, 453, 469  
*asat*, 457  
*asattva*, 339  
*asādhāraṇa-kāraṇa*, 224  
*Ascetic*, 293, 305, 520, 523, 524, 527  
*Ash*, 186  
*asmitā*, 470  
*Asoka*, 522  
*aspaṣṭavāt*, 537  
*Aspects*, 311, 414, 419, 454  
*assāda*, 513  
*Assembly*, 482  
*Assertion*, 313, 343, 344, 431, 432  
*Association*, 26, 185 n., 186, 187, 199, 224, 233, 284, 299, 300, 303, 308, 326, 327, 345, 389, 408, 412, 441, 469, 470, 474, 489, 493, 503, 509, 534, 535; of body, 389  
*Assumptions*, 186 n., 297, 298, 323, 338, 350, 424, 437, 439

- asteya*, 61  
*asthira*, 292  
*Asṭi-brahmeti-brūtya-artha-vicāra*, 131  
 Astronomy, 515 n.  
*asura*, 528, 529, 531 n.  
*Aṣṭādāśa-bheda-nirṇaya*, 85, 86, 88, 89 n., 90 n., 91, 92 n., 93 n., 132, 138; its contents, 88 *et seq.*  
*Aṣṭādāśa-rahasyārtha-nirṇaya*, 117  
*Aṣṭādāśa-rahasyārtha-vivaraṇa*, 85, 86, 87 n.  
*aṣṭāṅga yoga*, 24, 96, 98  
*Aṣṭāvīṃśad-vidhātmikā*, 501 n.  
*Aśvamedha-parvan*, 517  
*a-tathā-bhūtā-rtha-jñānam*, 247  
*Atharva-Veda*, 447  
 Atheism, 473, 479  
 Atheistic, 472, 480  
*atīprakāśa*, 503  
*atīśaya*, 203  
*atīndriya*, 225, 354  
 Atomic, 7, 51, 89, 100 n., 194, 281, 413, 432, 443, 444; individuals, 93; individual souls, 93; theory, 262  
 Atomists, 211, 264  
 Atoms, 128, 152, 155, 163, 183, 262, 264, 540, 541, 550  
 Attachment, 10, 29, 32, 34, 51, 71, 148, 287, 437, 441, 449, 450, 462, 464, 470, 506, 545  
 Attainment, 32, 60, 62, 70, 290, 429, 443, 445  
 Attention, 31, 310  
*Atthasālinī*, 514 n.  
 Attitude, 344  
 Attribute, 80, 192, 193, 195, 222, 407, 413  
 Attribution, 325, 472  
 Attutayi, 98  
 Auditory, 308; knowledge, 5; perception, 281  
 Aufrecht, 127  
*aupādṛhika*, 434  
 Author, 130  
 Authoritativeness, 20  
 Authority, 175, 517  
 Auto-intoxication, 82  
*avatāra*, 38, 39, 40 n., 129, 302, 401, 475  
*avayava*, 227, 232, 263  
*avayavi*, 263  
*avayavo-pacaya-pacayayor*, 386  
*avācyatva*, 230 n.  
*avāntara-vyāpāra*, 203  
*avāntava*, 436  
*avedināḥ*, 501  
*a-vedyatva*, 231, 307  
*avibhāga*, 455, 460  
*a-vidhi-gocaratva*, 88 n.  
*avidyā*, 4, 5, 29, 44, 46, 159, 160, 161, 163, 165, 169, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 194, 196, 198 n., 295, 296, 308, 316, 317, 319, 321, 322, 324, 326, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 337, 338, 339, 343, 345, 364, 365, 366, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 393, 414, 421, 422, 423, 436, 441, 443, 444, 445, 468, 469, 470, 476, 477, 478, 487, 492, 500, 507, 508 n.; Brahman cannot assume diverse forms on account of, 176; Brahman cannot be *āśraya* of it, 176; conception of its cessation criticized, 338 *et seq.*; in relation to self-luminosity, as treated by Vijñāna-Bhikṣu, 468 *et seq.*; it cannot veil Brahman, 176; its criticism by Veṅkaṭa, 330 *et seq.*; its opposition to *vidyā*, 176; Nimbārka's idea of, 411; Śaṅkara's conception refuted, 175 *et seq.*; the view of its difference from *māyā* criticized, 334 *et seq.*  
*avidyāyām jīvaḥ jīvāda vidyā*, 177 n.  
*a-visamvāditva*, 216  
*a-viśāda-svarūpa*, 177  
*aviśeṣa*, 499, 504  
*aviveka*, 449  
*avuddhipūrvaka*, 502  
*avyakta*, 34, 36, 45, 257, 476, 477, 488, 497, 504, 510, 511  
*Avyakta-nṛsimhapaniṣad*, 13  
*avyakti*, 52  
*Avyaktapaniṣad*, 13  
*a-vyavahita*, 136  
 Awakened state, 178  
 Awareness, 184, 185 n., 205, 217, 220, 248, 255, 319, 320, 321, 322, 340, 341, 344, 439  
 Ayodhyā, 103, 120  
*ayoni*, 46  
 Ayyappa, 133  
 Ayyar, Sir Subrahmanya, Lectures, 64 n., 65 n.  
*Ācāra-locana*, 133  
*ācārya*, 102  
*Ācārya-dīkṣita*, 130  
*Ācārya-hṛdaya*, 137, 138  
*Ācārya-pañcāśat*, 117  
*Ācārya-viṃśati*, 133  
*ādḥāra*, 454  
*ādḥārā-kāro-pādhi*, 333  
*ādheyatva*, 298  
*ādhyāsika-sambandha*, 423  
*ādhyātmiki*, 507

Āditya, 20  
 Ādivarāhācārya, 132  
 Ādivarāha Vedāntācārya, 131  
 āgama, 14, 487, 519  
 Āgama-prāmānya, 14, 17, 98, 154, 155  
 āgantuka-dharmavattvam, 393  
 Āgaṅgā, 96  
 āgneya-maṇḍala, 59  
 Ājīvaka sect, 522  
 ājīvakaś, 523, 524, 525  
 Ājīvakas, their views, 522  
 ājīvas, 523  
 ākāśa, 6, 48, 49 n., 163, 164, 252, 260,  
 261, 263, 280, 282, 283, 284, 498,  
 499, 504, 510  
 Ākāśādhikaraṇa-vicāra, 133  
 Ālaya-vijñāna, 274, 275  
 Ālavandār, 67 n., 97  
 Ājvartirunagari, 68  
 ānanda, 35, 154, 344, 444, 445,  
 486  
 Ānanda-dāyini, 122, 123, 131  
 Ānandagiri, 105, 106, 107  
 Ānanda-tāratamya-khaṇḍana, 129, 133,  
 392  
 Ānanda-vallārī, 122  
 ānukūlyasya samkalpa, 92  
 ānukūlyikī, 512  
 Āṅgīrasa, 21  
 Āṇbillai, 105  
 Āṇbillai-Kaṇḍāḍai-yappan, 64  
 Āṇḍāl, 63, 64, 65, 66 n., 67, 69, 77, 97,  
 109, 110, 134 n.  
 Āṇḍan lineage, 129  
 āparokṣya, 309  
 Ārādhana-krama, 122  
 Ārādhana-saṃgraha, 125, 352  
 ārjava, 61  
 Ārtti-prabandha, 138  
 Ārvār and Rāmānuja, difference of  
 outlook, 112  
 Ārvār Kula-śekhara, 80 n.  
 Ārvār literature, 91  
 Ārvārs, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 74,  
 75, 78, 79, 83, 84, 85, 86, 88 n., 89,  
 102, 105, 112, 124, 134, 138, 376;  
 Āṇḍāl's filial love, 77; Āṇḍāl's love  
 for God as Gopī, 77; the Āragiyas  
 generally followed Ārvārs, though  
 there were differences in religious  
 dogmas, 85; as Avatāras of, 64;  
 castes of, 64; cessation of inclina-  
 tions leads to God, 72; chronology  
 of, 64-8; conception of bridegroom  
 and bride, 79; difference of their  
 devotion with that of the Śaivas,  
 83; difference between Ārvārs and

Āragiyas on religious dogmas, 85-6;  
 distinguished from the Āragiyas, 68;  
 episode of the King Kula-śekhara,  
 feeling oneself as wife of God, 73;  
 fifth centum, 72-3; fourth centum,  
 72; God constantly wooing the  
 devotee, 78; God fettered by His  
 mercy, 78; God's grace, only means  
 of salvation, 78; influence of the  
 Purāṇic religion on the Ārvārs, 81;  
 lamentation for God, 73; lamentation  
 illustrated, 74, 75, 76; love of God,  
 ever growing, 79; meaning of, 68;  
 Nāmm'-ārvār's conception of soul,  
 79-80; Nāmm'-ārvār's third centum,  
 71; ninth centum, 73; pangs for God,  
 71; pathological symptoms of love  
 similar to those of the Vaiṣṇavas of  
 the Gauḍīya school, 83; Periy-  
 ārvār's conception of himself as  
 Yośodā, 77; philosophy of, 69 *et seq.*;  
 Rādhā (Nappināi) referred to as the  
 consort of Kṛṣṇa, 81; reference to in  
 Bhāgavata, 63; sources of, 64; stages  
 of God's love, 79; summary of  
 Śaṭhakopa's works, 70 *et seq.*; their  
 auto-intoxication, 82; their contro-  
 versy with the Vaiṣṇavas regarding  
 religious dogmas, 84; their distinc-  
 tion from the Āragiyas, 94; their  
 love ecstatic but not philosophic,  
 79; their love of God does not show  
 signs of gross criticism, 83; their  
 relation with the love of the Gauḍīya  
 school, 81-2; their works divided  
 into three rahasyas, 92; the Teṅgalai  
 and Vaḍagalai schools represent  
 the difference between the Ārvārs  
 and the Āragiyas, 86; they identify  
 themselves as legendary personages  
 associated with the life of Kṛṣṇa un-  
 like Bhāgavata, 81; they reveal a  
 knowledge of Purāṇic religion of  
 Kṛṣṇa, 80; they reveal in the devo-  
 tion all the principal types of  
 emotion, 83; they visualized God  
 everywhere through intoxication of  
 love, 83; Tīru-maṅgaiy's filial love,  
 77; Tīru-maṅgaiy and Nāmm'-ārvār,  
 difference of their love, 79; vision of  
 God, 72; works of, 68-9  
 Ārvār-Tirunagari, 103  
 Ārvāric Teṅgalai school, 86  
 āsana, 30, 60, 61, 505  
 āstika, 471, 518  
 āstikya, 62  
 Āsuri Keśava, 98, 100

- śāyā*, 44  
*āśrama*, 2, 11, 91, 293  
*āśraya*, 176, 407  
*Āśvalāyana-smṛti*, 20  
*ātma-caitanya*, 8  
*ātma-khyāti*, 238  
*ātma-nikṣepaḥ*, 92  
*ātma-samarpaṇa*, 60  
*Ātma-siddhi*, 207, 227  
*Ātman*, 30, 34, 142, 173, 338, 483, 486, 502, 510, 529  
*ātmā*, 80, 483, 485  
*ātmā-nubhava-lakṣaṇa-kaivalyā-khya-puruṣārthaḥ*, 382  
*ātmāśraya*, 255  
*ātmā vā are draṣṭavyaḥ*, 8  
*Ātreya*, 39, 106, 107, 119  
*Ātreya gotra*, 109, 110, 118  
*Ātreyanātha*, 114 n., 125  
*Ātreyanātha sūri*, 346  
*Ātreya Rāmānuja*, 119  
*Ātreya varada*, 132  
*Atri*, 21; lineage, 352  
*ātyantika*, 502, 503  
*āvaraṇa*, 283, 369, 372  
*āvaraṇā-bhāva*, 282  
*āveśāvātāra*, 38, 39, 475  
*āyata*, 514  
*āyatana*, 515  
*Āyur-veda*, 517  
  
 Bad, 80, 452, 521; actions, 414; deeds, 415, 444, 527  
 Badarī, 103  
 Badarī-nātha, 96  
*bala*, 37, 56  
 Balabhadraśārya, 401  
 Baladeva, 496  
 Balarāma, 392, 429  
*bandha*, 136  
 Bangkok, 515 n.  
 Baptism, 19  
 Barabar hills, 522  
 Barua, Dr, 521 n., 524 n.  
 Basic, 475; cause, 365; consciousness, 362; reality, 449  
 Basis, 46, 182, 192, 332, 334, 422, 423, 439, 440, 454, 456, 468, 471, 489, 494, 515  
 Bath, 104  
 Bādarāyaṇa, 15, 17, 125, 235, 381; his so-called refutation of Pañcarātra is not correct, 17; refutes the Pañcarātras, 15  
*bādha*, 459  
*bādhaka-saṃsarga-grahāṇam*, 186  
 Bādhūla Śrīnivāsācārya, 361  
  
*bāla-loka*, 513  
*Bāla-sarasvatī*, 133  
*Bārhaspatya*, 512, 533  
*Bārhaspatya-sūtra*, 532  
 Beauty, 71, 98  
 Becoming, 457  
 Before and after, 284  
 Beginning, 343, 544  
 Beginningless, 5, 6, 26, 27, 34, 43, 51, 54, 177, 198 n., 279, 284, 285, 330, 331, 339, 354, 367, 372, 373, 409, 413, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 444, 446, 448, 452, 467, 474, 477, 489, 497, 506, 544, 547; time, 316  
 Behaviour, 5, 179, 185, 187, 236, 240, 244, 246, 287  
 Behaviouristic action, 288  
 Beings, 30, 34, 42, 49, 54, 154, 190, 195, 239, 243, 312, 313, 314, 325, 339, 413, 421, 431, 436, 443 n., 447, 448, 450, 452, 454, 456, 457, 465, 474, 477, 480, 483, 488, 489, 509, 524  
 Belief, 55, 187, 204, 290  
 Bell, 119 n.  
 Bellary, 399  
 Benares, 103  
 Benediction, 42  
 Beneficent, 52  
 Beneficial, 51, 62; effects, 335  
 Bengal, 94, 112  
 Bengal Asiatic Society, 401  
 Besnagar Column, 19  
 Bhadantabhāskara, 3 n.  
 Bhaddā, 522  
*bhadra*, 30, 60  
*Bhagavad-ārādhana-krama*, 113  
*Bhagavad-gītā*, 97, 105, 379, 402, 482, 485  
*Bhagavad-guṇa-darpaṇa*, 119 n.  
*Bhagavad-vishayam*, 78 n., 79, 79 n.  
*bhagavanmaya*, 51  
*Bhagavat*, 107  
*bhagavat-prīty-artham*, 92  
 Bhagavat Senāpati Mīśra, 117, 132  
*Bhagavati-sūtra*, 522, 524 n., 525  
*bhagavān*, 34, 107 n., 475, 508 n.  
 Bhaktagrāmapūrṇa, 110  
 Bhaktāṅghrīreṇu, 63  
*bhakti*, 17, 19, 32, 33, 63, 63 n., 93, 100, 139, 161, 292, 293, 378, 380, 382, 450, 451, 507, 509; as conjugal love, 70; as *dārya*, 70; cult, 63; in Vijñāna Bhikṣu, 450 *et seq.*; Veṅkaṭa's views, 292 *et seq.*  
*bhakti-exultation*, 78  
 Bhakti-sāra, 63, 96 n.

- bhakti-yoga*, 89, 91, 100  
 Bhandarkar, Sir R. G., 64 n., 66, 67, 80 n., 399, 402; *Report of the Search for Sanskrit Manuscripts 1882-1883*, 401  
*bhantikas*, 182  
 Bharadvāja, 530  
 Bharadvāja gotra, 98  
 Bharadvāja lineage, 133, 440  
*Bharadvāja Saṃhitā*, 379  
 Bhartṛhari, 108  
 Bhartṛmitra, 108  
 Bhartṛ-prapañca, 108, 471  
 Bharuchi, 139  
 Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara, 1, 2, 3 n.  
 Bhaṭṭanātha, 137, 138  
 Bhaṭṭārakaguru, 210, 214 n., 226, 229, 234; his view of doubt, 210  
 Bhaṭṭārya, 134  
 Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita, 1, 19 n.; speaking of Bhāskara, 1  
 Bhāgavata cult, 19  
 Bhāgavata school, 3 n.  
*Bhāgavata-māhātmya*, 63  
*Bhāgavata-purāṇa*, 40 n., 63, 63 n., 66, 67, 80 n., 81, 402, 451, 518  
*Bhāgavata-yoga*, 24, 32  
 Bhāgavatas, 2, 15, 17, 19, 20, 71, 450, 475 n., 518 n., 527 n.; not low castes, 17  
*Bhāguri*, 516, 531  
*Bhāmatt*, 4, 196, 196 n., 476  
 Bhāskara, 1, 2, 3, 3 n., 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 106, 108, 113, 124, 155, 192, 193, 194, 195, 197, 200, 201, 301, 305, 413, 429, 433, 434, 472, 497; a tri-dandī, 1; *bhakti*, nature of, 10; Brahman as transcendent, 10; Brahman not exhausted in transformation, 10; deeds, relation of, with knowledge, 7; difference between his view and that of Śāṅkara, 2; epistemology distinguished from Śāṅkara, 9; his *bhedābheda* concept, 6; his causality view of, 4-5; his date, 3; his difference with Kumārila, 8; his sea and wave illustration, 6; his view, God and soul relation of, 6; his view of Brahman, 301; his view of God, 155; his views contrasted with those of Rāmānuja, 192 *et seq.*; his views criticized from the Nimbārka point of view, 431 *et seq.*; *jīvan-mukti*, denial of, 10-11; *jñāna-samuccita-karma*, his view of, 8; knowledge, his view of, 8; liberation, nature of, 9; liberation of duties, 9; *mukti*, way to, 10; relation of *Brahma-sūtra* with *Mīmāṃsā-sūtra*, his concept of, 7; relation to Pañcarātras, p. 2; *sat cit* and *ananta*, identity of, 10; soul nature of, 7; soul relation with God, 7; substance and qualities, view of, 10; Śāṅkara, refutation of, 4-5; transcendent Brahman, nature of, 10; world as spiritual, 10  
 Bhāskara Bhaṭṭa, 3  
*Bhāskara-bhāṣya*, 2 n., 4, 6 n., 7, 8 n.  
 Bhāskaradeva, 3 n.  
 Bhāskaradikṣita, 3 n.  
 Bhāskaramiśra, 3 n.  
 Bhāskarānṣimha, 3 n.  
 Bhāskarasena, 3 n.  
 Bhāskaraśāstri, 3 n.  
 Bhāskarācārya, 3  
 Bhāskarācārya, Paṇḍita, 3 n.  
 Bhāskarānandanātha, 3 n.  
 Bhāskarāranya, 3 n.  
 Bhāskarites, 431  
*bhāṣya*, 88 n., 107 n., 108, 109, 113, 114, 115, 116, 118, 138, 139, 181 n., 196, 298, 352, 395, 400, 514  
*bhāṣya-kāra*, 108  
*Bhāṣya-prakāśikā-dūṣanoddhāra*, 114  
*Bhāṣya-vivaraṇa*, 128  
*bhāṣyopodghāta*, 106  
 Bhāṭṭa, 248  
 Bhāudāji, Dr 3  
*bhāva*, 52  
*bhāva-jā*, 29  
*bhāvaka*, 50, 51, 53  
*Bhāva-prabodha*, 114 n., 125  
*Bhāva-pradīpikā*, 116, 131  
*Bhāva-prakāśa*, 122  
*Bhāva-prakāśikā*, 114, 122, 131  
*Bhāva-prakāśikā-dūṣanoddhāra*, 130  
*bhāva-rūpā'-jñāna*, 361  
*bhāvya*, 50, 51, 53  
*bheda*, 6, 194, 223, 417  
*Bheda-darpaṇa*, 115, 384, 388, 392  
*Bheda-maṇi*, 115 n., 384  
*Bheda-vāda*, 133  
*bheda-vādi*, 401  
*bhedābheda*, 1, 28, 105, 107, 406, 413, 471, 472  
*Bhedā-bheda-vāda*, 405  
*Bheda-dhikkāra-nyakkāra*, 122  
*bhedāgraha*, 186  
 Bhikṣu, 281 n., 448, 450, 451, 452, 456, 460, 465, 466, 467, 468, 471, 472, 473, 474, 477, 478, 479, 487, 488

- bhinnatve satyabhinna-sattākatvam*, 373  
*bhoga*, 300, 464, 485, 495  
*bhogyā-śakti*, 6  
*bhoktr*, 6  
*Bhrānta-yogīndra*, 63 n.  
*Bhṛgu*, 482  
*Bhutan*, 68 n.  
*Bhū-gola-nirṇaya*, 122  
*Bhūmi*, 41, 57, 511  
*Bhūri Bhaṭṭa*, 402  
*Bhūri Śrīśailapūrṇa*, 98, 109  
*bhūta-modifications*, 183  
*Bhūtapurī*, 100, 101  
*bhūtas*, 163, 182, 260 n., 261, 502, 504, 507, 510  
*bhūta-sarga*, 502 n.  
*Bhūtatt'-āgvār*, 63, 64, 65, 68, 66 n., 68 n., 134 n.  
*Bhūtayogīndra*, 63 n.  
*bhūta-yomi*, 25  
*bhūtādī*, 48, 163, 259, 260, 261, 498, 499, 504, 510  
*bhūtāmi*, 512  
*bhūtātmā*, 25  
*bhūti*, 44  
*bhūti-bhedāḥ*, 44  
*bhūti-śakti*, 42  
*bhūty-aṃśah*, 44  
*bhūyo-darśana-gamya*, 228  
*Bibliotheca Indica*, 483 n.  
*Bile*, 182  
*bindu*, 58  
*Bio-motor*, 59, 258; faculties, 540  
*Birth*, 33, 51, 287, 290, 294, 370, 382, 431, 462, 549  
*Bison*, 234  
*Bittideva*, 104, 113  
*bījāṅkura*, 177  
*Black Rati*, 38  
*Blind*, 367; man, 390  
*Bliss*, 16, 34, 35, 41, 50, 51, 52, 71, 144, 154, 175, 295, 302, 304, 311, 365, 366, 404, 408, 413, 414, 441, 442, 443, 445, 448, 463, 474, 485, 486, 489, 494  
*Blissful*, 62; emotion, 71; nature, 383  
*Blissfulness*, 325  
*Blue colour*, 153  
*Boar*, 38  
*boddhā*, 48  
*bodha-lakṣaṇa*, 10  
*Bodhāyana*, 105, 108, 109, 139, 180, 181 n., 192, 350  
*Bodhāyana-vṛtti*, 102, 103 n.  
*Bodhisattva*, 513  
*Bodily charms*, 83  
*Body*, 7, 31, 33, 41, 55, 58, 59, 60, 80, 139, 191, 192, 194, 195, 199, 201, 288, 289, 291, 295, 297, 298, 300, 301, 302, 308, 325, 327, 352, 365, 369, 391, 412, 414, 444, 448, 450, 451, 456, 462, 475, 504, 522, 526, 528, 529, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 546, 548, 549, 550; of God, 71  
*Bombay*, 200 n.  
*Bond* 26; of sympathy, 71  
*Bondage*, 5, 7, 24, 27, 44, 51, 57, 136, 201, 292, 295, 334, 364, 365, 370, 407, 410, 412, 414, 421, 432, 433, 437, 453, 457, 460, 476, 477, 491, 495, 506, 509  
*Brahmā*, 306, 473, 474  
*brahma-bhakti*, 507  
*brahma-carya*, 61  
*Brahma-causality*, 116, 388, 396  
*brahma-cārin*, 124  
*Brahma-character*, 366  
*Brahmadatta*, 108, 291; his view of Brahman, 291  
*Brahma-experience*, 465; treatment by Vijñāna Bhikṣu, 465  
*Brahmahood*, 17, 405 n., 506  
*Brahma-jñāna-nirāsa*, 130  
*Brahma-knowledge*, 2, 4, 89, 305, 308, 326, 336, 337, 435, 466  
*Brahma-lakṣaṇa-vāda*, 133  
*Brahma-lakṣaṇa-vākyārtha*, 130  
*Brahma-lakṣaṇa-vākyārtha-saṃgraha*, 130  
*brahma-laya*, 509  
*Brahma-manifestation*, 373  
*Brahman*, 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 20, 26, 28, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 37, 39, 68, 89, 93, 106, 116, 126, 136 n., 153, 154, 155, 156, 165, 166, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 208, 211, 224, 239, 291, 295, 299, 300 n., 301, 302, 303, 307, 309, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 319, 320, 322, 323, 325, 326, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 340, 343, 345, 350, 351, 352, 365, 366, 367, 369, 371, 372, 373, 374, 381, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 391, 392, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 412, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 429, 430, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 445, 446, 447, 448, 452, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 460, 461, 462, 464, 465, 466, 477, 483, 484,

## Brahman (cont.)

- 485, 486, 487, 492, 493, 494, 495,  
497, 506, 509; material and efficient  
cause, 301  
Brahmanandin, 106, 107  
Brahman-consciousness, 317  
Brahmanhood, 383 n.  
Brahmanic, 515 n.  
Brahman of Śaṅkara, 396  
Brahman's nature, 397  
Brahmaṇa, 527  
*brahma-randhira*, 31, 59  
*Brahma-rātra*, 23  
*brahma-samasattāka-vikārā - ṅīkārāt*,  
396  
*Brahma-saṃhitā*, 40 n.; *avatāras* in,  
40 n.  
*Brahma-sarga*, 25  
Brahma-state, 468  
*Brahma-sūtra*, 1, 3, 4, 7 n., 15, 17, 102,  
105, 107, 108, 113, 116, 117, 118,  
124, 125, 126, 133, 139, 195, 196,  
305, 349, 350, 381, 402, 404, 405 n.,  
406 n., 440, 454, 465, 466, 472, 478,  
479, 480, 482, 496, 517 n., 548  
*Brahma - sūtra - bhāṣya-pūrvā-pakṣa-*  
*saṃgraha-kārikā*, 117  
*Brahma-sūtra-bhāṣya-rambha-prayo-*  
*yana-samarthana*, 118  
*Brahma-sūtra-bhāṣya-saṃgraha-viva-*  
*raṇa*, 118  
*Brahma-sūtra-bhāṣya-vyākhyā*, 117,  
130  
*Brahma-sūtra-bhāṣyopā-nyāsa*, 117,  
125  
*Brahma-sūtra-dīpikā*, 118, 133  
*Brahma-sūtrārtha-saṃgraha*, 108, 116,  
130  
*Brahma-śabdārtha-vicāra*, 130, 131  
*Brahma-śakti-vāda*, 133  
Brahmatantra-jīyar, 111  
*Brahma-vidyā-kaumudī*, 115  
*Brahma-vidyā-vijaya*, 117, 126  
Brahma-viṣṇu, 497  
Brahmā, 12, 13, 25, 38, 40 n., 43, 45,  
52, 232, 475, 499, 503, 504, 505, 507,  
510  
*Brahmā-jñāna-vādi*, 177 n.  
*brahmāṇḍa*, 38  
*Brahmāṇḍa-purāṇa*, 20  
*brahmātmavā*, 431  
Brahminic, 2, 19  
Brahmins, 14, 17, 1 n., 97, 441 n., 516,  
517, 518, 521, 549  
*brahmī*, 47  
*brahmopāśanam*, 382  
*brāhma*, 502

## Breath, 60

- Breath-control, 23  
*Bṛhad-āranyaka Upaniṣad*, 494, 519,  
519 n., 528, 529  
*Bṛhad-āranyako-paṇiṣat-prakāśikā*, 126  
*Bṛhaj-jātaka*, 523  
Bṛhaspati, 12, 140 n., 516, 531, 532,  
533  
*Bṛhaspati-sūtra*, 531  
Bridegroom, 79, 378  
Brindaban, 63, 120, 440  
Buddha, 39, 505, 522  
Buddhaghoso, 512, 513, 520, 521 n.,  
522, 524 n.  
*buddhi*, 7, 43, 47, 49, 56, 80, 144, 147,  
148, 163, 449, 453, 464, 465, 466,  
467, 468, 469, 470, 476, 480, 486,  
490, 491, 494, 495, 499 n., 503, 506,  
507, 508; in relation to *sukha-*  
*duḥkha* in Viññāna Bhikṣu, 464  
Buddhism, 143, 516  
*buddhi*-states, 467  
Buddhist doctrine of momentariness,  
refutation by Venkṭa, 268 *et seq.*  
Buddhist theory, 262  
Buddhist view, 251-2, 541  
Buddhistic doctrines, 518  
Buddhistic literature, 520  
Buddhistic texts, 518  
Buddhists, 1, 129, 205, 216, 236, 238,  
254, 255, 268, 269, 270, 271, 275,  
276, 282, 398, 424, 443, 471, 512,  
513, 518, 519, 525, 527, 538, 539,  
540, 541, 543, 546; view of in-  
validity inadmissible, 236  
*buddhi-tattva*, 25  
Bukka I, King, 121  
Bukka's son Kampana, 121  
Burning capacity, 249  
Burning object, 249  
  
Caitanya, 403  
*caitanya*, 8, 81, 141, 451  
*Caitanya-caritāmṛta*, 403 n.  
*Cakāra-samarthana*, 123  
*cakra*, 58, 60, 64  
*cakṣus*, 502  
Calinness, 52  
Campakeśa, 115, 117, 131  
*Caṇḍa-māruta*, 117, 123, 126, 129  
Capacity, 149, 349, 354; of fire, 249  
*Caraka-saṃhitā*, 516  
*carama*, 135 n.  
*Carama-guru-nirṇaya*, 125  
*Carama-śloka-churukku*, 94  
*Caramopāya-tātparya*, 122  
Cardinal faith, 86

- Cardinal points, 85, 86  
*Carnatica*, 104 n.  
 Carnatik, 63  
 Case, 288  
 Case-ending, 239  
 Case-relation, 233  
 Caste, 17, 42, 43, 49, 293, 416, 441 n., 518, 549  
 Caste-distinction, 44  
 Caste-duties, 33, 414  
 Casuistry, 514, 515  
 Catalogue, 400  
*Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Private Libraries of the North-Western Provinces*, 379, 400 n., 401 n.  
*Catalogus Catalogorum*, 127  
 Category, 2, 30, 36, 37, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 80, 89, 98, 128, 129, 150, 223, 224, 239, 257, 258, 297, 328, 339, 340, 350, 351, 353, 354, 355, 417, 428, 429, 435, 480, 503, 540; of difference, 417; of time, 284  
 Catholic, 104  
*Catuh-sloki*, 94 n., 98, 99, 123  
*Catuh-sloki-vyākhyā*, 131  
*Catur-vyūha*, 509 n  
 Causal, 46, 265, 341, 344, 470, 473, 484; agents, 267; constituent, 267; doctrine, 199; efficiency, 268, 271, 276, 436, 458; entity, 371; instruments, 203; material, 465; moment, 273; movement, 502; nature, 395; operation, 205, 263, 265, 266, 267, 270, 272, 276, 343; principle, 192; qualities, 256; relations, 279, 342; state, 42, 200, 344; substance, 344, 391  
 Causality, 53, 128, 205, 206, 276, 278, 299, 300, 389, 396, 455, 456, 459, 470  
 Causation, 354, 397, 456, 541, 543  
 Cause, 4, 8, 9, 24, 42, 46, 58, 174, 179, 181, 184, 186, 187, 189, 190, 192, 193, 194, 195, 197, 198, 199, 204, 206, 232, 256, 257, 260 n., 266, 267, 270, 271, 276, 277, 278, 279, 293, 295, 299, 306, 310, 330, 333, 339, 341, 342, 343, 350, 354, 365, 366, 385, 388, 389, 396, 406, 410, 413, 433, 441, 447 n., 448, 452, 454, 455, 456, 460, 465, 469, 470, 472, 473, 479, 483, 493, 495, 503, 509, 520, 524, 539 n., 541, 542, 543, 545, 547; and effect, 258; qualities, 257  
 Causeless, 46, 354  
 Cause-moment, 273  
 Cause-space, 273  
 Cause-time, 273  
 Cārvāka, 139, 140, 276, 280, 282, 286, 288, 289, 432, 512, 515, 516, 522, 528, 531, 533, 536, 538, 539, 541, 544, 546, 549, 550; contention, 535; criticisms against by Jains and Naiyāyikas, 546; criticisms of the Buddhists, against, 541 *et seq.*; doctrine, 546; his logic, 533 *et seq.*; his logic criticized by Jayanta, Udayana, etc., 537 *et seq.*; logic, 533; other criticisms against, 548 *et seq.*; reference to, 531 *et seq.*; their arguments for denying soul, 289 n.; types of, 539  
*Cārvārka-śaṣṭi*, 531 n.  
*Cārvākism*, 139  
 Cease, 310  
 Central question, 50  
 Centum, 72  
 Ceremonial duties, 160  
 Ceremonials, 41  
 Cessation, 27, 28, 52, 61, 136, 177, 287, 292, 293, 295, 310, 321, 338, 339, 365, 366, 369, 371, 372, 374, 393, 445, 453, 463, 470, 486, 506, 523, 572; of bondage, 364; of rebirth, 70  
*ceṣṭā*, 300  
*chala*, 512  
*Chalāri-smṛti*, 103  
 Change, 196, 313, 314, 321, 325, 338, 344, 443 n., 445, 447, 456, 457, 458, 485, 488, 489, 490, 493, 495  
 Changeable, 313, 323  
 Changeless, 34, 61, 195, 389, 396, 457  
 Character, 46, 180, 181, 193, 194, 195, 209, 210, 297, 311, 312, 315, 319, 323, 324, 331, 332, 333, 334, 336, 351, 407, 408, 411, 430, 465, 534, 548  
 Characteristic, 185, 207, 209, 212, 300, 317, 325, 350, 426, 450; quality, 317  
 Characterless, 166, 195, 356  
 Charity, 86, 87  
 Charm of God, 83  
*Chāndoagyopaniṣad-bhāṣya*, 117  
*Chāndogya*, 101, 106, 528, 529, 530  
*Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, 3, 106, 107, 126, 517, 528; heretics referred to, in, 528  
*Chāndogya-upaniṣad-prakāśikā*, 126  
 Chemical change, 141  
 Chimerical, 179, 191, 241, 271, 312, 314, 319, 331, 339, 406, 435; entities, 239, 243, 271, 333, 344, 440; objects, 274; theory, 266

- Choice, 304  
 Chowkhamba, 202 n., 209 n.  
 Chronological, 68  
*cic-chakti*, 32, 416  
*cidaṃśa*, 301  
*cin-mātram*, 165  
*cintanātmakam indriyam*, 48  
 Circular, 255  
 Circulation, 59  
 Circumstances, 182, 320, 323, 349, 430  
*cit*, 154, 391, 396, 397, 444  
*citi*, 503, 504  
*Cit-prakaraṇa*, 160 n.  
 Citsukha, 111, 468  
*citsukhācārya*, 318, 482  
*citta*, 281 n., 480, 499 n.  
*citta-vṛtti-nirodha*, 62, 506  
 Class-characters, 167, 232, 534  
 Class-concept, 224, 226 n., 297, 436  
 Class-notions, 61  
 Classification, 30, 129, 212  
 Clay, 3, 4 n., 199; materials, 3  
 Clearness, 217  
 Clinging to God, 87  
 Closed souls, 501  
 Cloth, 190, 193, 256, 265  
 Clouds, 50  
 Code of duties, 88  
 Coeval, 183  
 Co-existence, 273, 543  
 Co-existent, 286, 423  
 Co-extensive, 291, 292  
 Cognate, 43  
 Cognition, 8, 9, 217, 218, 248, 289, 310, 311, 315, 318, 320, 323, 325, 335, 347, 360, 368, 410, 411, 428  
 Cognitive, 31, 49, 61, 318, 466; experiences, 300; characters, 241; operation, 359; process, 467; relation, 358; sense, 25, 48, 280; situation, 467  
 Coherence, 300; of qualities, 254  
 Coimbatore, 121  
 Cola, 65, 67, 94, 98, 103, 113, 523; kings, 104  
 Collocating entities, 275  
 Collocation, 141, 152, 204, 206, 264, 292, 354, 360, 473; of accessories, 354; of causes, 203  
 Collocative agents, 342  
 Collocative causes, 248  
 Colony, 42, 43  
 Colophon of Mitra, 403  
 Colour, 61, 141, 167, 182, 251, 389; perception, 280  
 Colour-data, 253  
 Colour-datum, 253  
 Combinations, 326  
 Commands, 303  
 Commentary, 1 n., 3, 99, 102 n., 106, 107, 108, 114, 115, 116, 117, 120, 122, 123, 125, 126, 127, 130, 131, 132, 134, 138, 214, 260 n., 305, 349, 402, 403, 440, 460, 476, 482, 516, 517 n., 518, 523, 532; literature, 86  
 Commentator, 107 n., 196, 444  
 Commission, 398  
 Common, 207  
 Communication, 309, 428  
 Communion, 70, 99, 376  
 Companions, 83  
 Compendium, 135  
 Complete, 36, 296  
 Complex, 188, 193; feeling, 90  
 Comprehension, 419  
 Computation, 96  
 Conative, 49; organs, 412; senses, 31, 61, 280, 504  
 Conceit, 173  
 Concentration, 30  
 Concept, 42, 53, 185, 186, 195, 254, 264, 297, 340, 344, 390, 406, 434, 435  
 Conception, 45, 192, 195, 295, 297, 301, 321, 328, 333, 335, 341, 351, 389, 397, 398, 447, 448, 451, 456, 462, 468, 504  
 Conceptual cognitions, 341  
 Conceptual forms, 311  
 Conch-shell, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 208, 210, 211, 241, 244, 247, 253, 254, 270, 337, 346, 368, 371, 408; silver, 179, 184, 237, 246, 312, 314, 335, 336, 340, 343, 344, 398; silver illusion, 185 n., 186, 188  
 Conciliatory, 20  
 Conclusions, 211, 319, 409, 451, 458, 469, 486, 495  
 Concomitance, 225, 226, 228, 229, 230, 263, 273, 319, 427, 438, 513, 533, 534, 535, 536, 538  
 Concrete, 49, 187  
 Condition, 51, 180, 181, 193, 211, 301, 306, 310, 312, 318, 323, 333, 344, 346, 412, 413, 416, 420, 421, 422, 428, 432, 433, 434, 461, 463, 468, 473, 476, 489, 492, 493, 534, 535; of reality, 243  
 Conditional, 289, 390, 533, 538; qualities, 285, 286  
 Conditioned, 193, 446, 474  
 Conduct, 16, 550

- Conflict of knowledge, 212 n.  
 Confusion, 25, 140  
 Conglomeration, 37, 163, 252, 262, 275, 278, 288  
 Conjeevaram, 68  
 Connection, 43 n.  
 Connotation, 299  
 Conscious, 27, 31, 41, 290, 416, 467, 491; energy, 459; entities, 89; principle, 29; state, 540, 543, 546  
 Consciousness, 368, 369, 373, 377, 406, 407, 413, 420, 429, 438, 439, 440, 452, 454, 459, 460, 462, 463, 467, 469, 479, 486, 507, 519, 529, 540, 541, 543, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549; its character, 141, 142  
 Considerations, 420  
 Consonance, 44, 58  
 Consort, 70, 81  
 Constancy, 29  
 Constituent conscious-entities, 287  
 Constituents, 188, 256, 310, 323, 335, 414, 415, 419, 424, 430, 455, 458  
 Constituted entity, 256  
 Construction, 191, 195  
 Contact, 263, 270, 281 n., 316, 453, 466  
 Container, 456  
 Contemplation, 68  
 Contemporary, 131 n., 135  
 Content, 250 n., 310, 329, 336, 439; of awareness, 185 n.; of knowledge, 242, 247, 314  
 Contentions, 211, 311, 315, 348  
 Contentless, 250, 310, 311  
 Contentment, 61, 506  
 Contents of thoughts, 198  
 Contiguity, 46, 296, 316, 324, 325, 421; of consciousness, 240, 420  
 Contraction, 393  
 Contradiction, 9, 186, 192, 210, 239, 269, 314, 318, 321, 327, 336, 337, 342, 374, 386, 398, 435, 436, 451, 459, 470, 498, 502 n.; of knowledge, 179  
 Contradictory, 17, 207, 211, 269, 310, 319, 337, 421  
 Contrary, 322; conclusion, 230  
 Contributions, 346  
 Control, 30, 32, 58, 303, 430, 443 n., 444, 499; of mind, 29  
 Controller, 99, 200, 386, 415, 429, 430, 451, 478  
 Controversialist, 406  
 Controversy, 68, 128, 130, 328, 416  
 Conviction, 54, 55  
 Co-operation, 409  
 Corporeal structure, 431  
 Correct, 180  
 Correction, 179  
 Correspondence, 247, 348, 357; theory, 246  
 Corroboration, 340, 341, 357  
 Cosmic, 443 n., 475, 482, 492, 509, 510; affairs, 475; egg, 504; matter, 163  
 Cosmogony, 515 n.  
 Cosmological, 474  
 Cotton-seed, 273  
 Counterpart, 58  
 Couples, 38  
 Course, 31, 34, 51, 52, 56, 57  
 Cow, 234  
 Cowell, 515  
 Creation, 25, 27, 36, 38, 42, 45, 50, 51, 52, 56, 58, 116, 158, 182, 188, 192, 195, 196, 302, 443 n., 444, 449, 452, 458, 460, 476, 498, 500, 501, 502, 504, 508  
 Creative, 50, 465, 473; activity, 452, 454; desire, 48; moment, 472  
 Creator, 16, 412, 476, 507  
 Creatures, 447 n.  
 Creed, 433  
 Criterion, 314  
 Criticism, 76, 112, 116, 179, 215, 217, 304, 339, 342, 429, 433, 478, 479, 518, 533  
 Crooked, 158  
 Cults, 81  
 Currency, 95  
 Customs, 2  
*Cūlikopaniṣad*, 480  
 Cycle, 41, 51, 446, 481, 490  
 Cymbals, 80  
*dakṣiṇa*, 381 n.  
*Dakṣiṇa-kalārya*, 381, 382, 383, 384  
 Dancer, 85  
 Dantivarman, 67  
*daṇḍa-nīti*, 532  
*daṇḍin*, 524 n.  
 Darkness, 178  
*darśana*, 463, 533  
 Daśaratha, 429, 522  
*Daśa-śloki*, 399, 400, 403  
*daśavat*, 251  
 Data, 210, 428  
 Dattātreya, 40 n.  
*Dattātreyaopaniṣad*, 13  
 Date-juice, 226  
 Datum, 287  
 Davids, 515

- dayā*, 57, 61  
 Dayārāmadeva, 402  
 Dāmodara, 39  
 Dāmodara Gosvāmi, 399  
*dāna*, 33, 61  
 Dāśarathi, 98, 102, 104, 109, 110, 113  
 Dāsārya, 63 *n.*  
*dāśya*, 70  
 Dead, 550  
 Death, 69, 291, 431, 447, 519, 530, 531, 536, 539, 548, 550  
 Death-coma, 79  
 Decay, 447 *n.*, 454, 547  
 Decision, 210  
 Deduction, 314  
 Deeds, 7, 15, 33, 54, 61, 290, 292, 299, 301, 303, 349, 388, 415, 429, 444, 452, 489, 513 *n.*, 521, 524, 528  
 Deep concentration, 22  
 Deep emotion, 378  
 Deep sleep, 142, 151, 178  
 Defect, 175, 177, 179, 182, 184, 185 *n.*, 203, 230, 238, 331, 332, 334, 336, 338, 356, 430, 437, 439, 442  
 Defectlessness, 250  
 Defects of organs, 181  
 Defence, 300  
 Definable, 230  
 Definite effects, 279  
 Definition, 128, 217 *n.*, 221, 232, 295, 298, 299, 300, 318, 345, 348, 373, 390, 424, 448, 462, 519, 537; of error, 247; of validity, 248  
*dehātma-vādins*, 528  
 Deity, 31, 38, 39, 41, 58, 60, 126, 295, 303  
 Delirious, 79  
 Deliverance, 376  
 Delusion, 325  
 Delusive, 45  
 Demerit, 15, 153, 453  
 Demons, 25  
 Demonstrable, 230  
 Denial, 186  
 Dependence, 55, 272, 299  
 Descartes, 202 *n.*  
 Description, 52, 436  
 Desires, 7, 33, 34, 44, 45, 48, 61, 92, 146, 160, 191, 296, 298, 303, 350, 416, 429, 441, 463, 472, 503, 504, 505, 506, 529  
 Destiny, 43, 45, 444, 461, 501, 502  
 Destroyer, 499, 507  
 Destructible, 199, 373, 425  
 Destruction, 26, 33, 38, 51, 52, 58, 178, 239, 271, 272, 308, 314, 344, 353, 365, 407, 410, 428, 442, 443 *n.*, 454, 469, 476, 550  
 Destructive agents, 266  
 Deśikācārya, 116, 131  
 Detachment, 442  
 Determinate, 166, 220, 311, 466; knowledge, 216, 217, 221, 224, 340; object, 177  
 Determinateness, 218  
 Determination of validity, 357  
 Determinations, 42, 113, 504  
 Deussen, 108 *n.*  
*devadatta*, 59, 60  
 Devaki Śrī, 95  
 Devamannātha, 102 *n.*, 110  
 Devanātha, 133  
*Deva-nāyaka-pañcāśat*, 122  
 Devarāja, 110, 111, 114, 138  
 Devarājaguru, 137, 138  
 Devarāja Sūri, 122  
 Devarājācārya, 123, 127  
 Devarāt, 102 *n.*, 110  
*deva-yāna*, 517  
 Devācārya, 401, 404  
 Devācārya, Paṇḍita Anantarāma, 399  
 Devādevī, 69  
 Development, 42, 49  
 Deviprasad Paṇḍita, 400 *n.*  
 Devī, 57  
 Devotee, 28, 38, 39 *n.*, 55, 70, 82, 89, 90, 99, 129, 337, 378, 379, 405, 442, 491  
 Devotion, 10, 13, 32, 61, 70, 78, 82, 84, 88, 89, 100, 129, 134, 161, 442, 450, 451; to God, 89  
 Devotional, 69, 293; development, 81; faiths, 81; Devotional songs, 83  
*dhananāṇḍya*, 59  
 Dhanurdāsa, 104  
 Dhanvantari, 40 *n.*  
 Dharma, 40 *n.*, 47, 62, 124, 125, 153, 254, 294, 349, 394, 405, 453, 503, 505  
 Dharmadevācārya, 404  
 Dharmakureśa, 133  
 Dharmarājadhvarindra, 9, 204, 216  
*dharmā-sādhya*, 224  
*Dharma-śāstras*, 21  
*dharmatva*, 254  
 Dharmarāja, 228  
*dhāraṇa*, 61  
*dhāraṇā*, 30, 505  
 Dhenu, 52  
*dhi-sphuṭatā*, 217  
*dhoti*, 522  
 Dhruva, 39 *n.*  
*dhruvā-nusmṛti*, 293  
*dhyti*, 57, 61, 510  
*dhūma-dhūmatva*, 226 *n.*  
*dhūmatva*, 535  
*dhūrta cārvāha*, 516, 539

- dhvamsā-bhāva*, 428  
*dhyaṇa*, 10, 30, 61, 388, 487, 505  
*dhyaṇādinaṁ paricaryā*, 10  
 Dialectic, 239, 426  
 Dialectical, 111, 194, 304, 437; analysis, 112; criticism, 277  
*Dialogues of the Buddha*, 512 n., 514 n., 515 n., 520 n., 521 n.  
 Dictum, 320  
 Didactic poem, 121  
 Difference, 6, 28, 30, 180, 181, 182, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 192, 193, 194, 195, 204, 220 n., 228, 266, 303, 312, 322, 330, 331, 342, 343, 350, 351, 353, 354, 355, 356, 359, 383, 405, 411, 413, 417, 418, 419, 422, 433, 434, 435, 436, 443, 448, 455, 456, 471, 480, 485, 486, 489, 536, 542, 550; conception of the Nimbarkas school of, 417 *et seq.*  
 Difference-in-identity, 432, 433  
 Differenceless, 406, 420  
 Differencelessness, 167  
 Different, 42, 302, 330, 336, 339, 397, 406, 413, 416, 441; order, 419  
 Different-from-existent-and-non-existent, 339  
 Differentia, 212, 429  
 Differentiating characteristic, 185 n.  
 Differentiation, 200, 462, 479  
 Difficulty, 192  
*Digamvara* Jains, 523, 524  
*Digamvaras*, 523  
*dik*, 163, 283, 284  
 Dilation, 444  
*Dina-caryā*, 137  
 Direct, 309, 465; intuition, 363; knowledge, 217, 312; perception, 308  
 Disappearance, 309  
 Disciple, 98, 102, 110, 114, 122, 123, 126, 138, 522  
 Discipline, 28, 29, 33, 442  
 Disciplined, 32  
 Discrimination, 292  
 Discriminative, 49; knowledge, 52  
 Discussions, 123, 352, 418  
 Disfavour, 51, 52, 159, 160, 164  
 Disinclination, 33, 47, 52, 292, 442; of mind, 29  
 Displeasure, 291, 303, 304  
 Disposition, 54  
 Disputation, 515, 517, 518, 519  
 Dissipation, 287  
 Dissociation, 393  
 Dissolution, 36, 45, 49, 50, 158, 196, 301, 314, 450, 458, 461, 466, 469, 493, 498, 521; of doubt, 390  
 Distant perception, 254  
 Distinct perception, 254  
 Distinction, 47, 181, 185 n., 186 n., 288, 307, 331, 411, 419, 434, 449, 485, 491, 494  
 Distinctive differences, 167  
 Distinctness, 254  
*diṣṭika*, 518  
 Diverse forms, 36  
 Diversity, 196  
 Divine, 41, 472; beauty, 136; entity, 485; functions, 38; grace, 84, 378; love, 451  
*Divine Wisdom*, 80 n.  
*Divine Wisdom of the Drāviḍa Saints*, 78, 79 n.  
 Divinity, 450  
 Division, 208  
*divya*, 214 n.  
*Divya-prabandha*, 64, 130, 134, 135, 137, 138  
*Divya-prabandha-vyākhyā*, 131  
*Divya-sūri-carita*, 64, 94, 95, 105, 113 n.  
*Divya-sūri-prabhāva-dīpikā*, 118, 132  
*Divyāvadāna*, 514, 524 n.  
*Dīgha*, 515 n., 521  
*Dīgha Nikāya*, 514, 520, 524, 525  
*Dīkṣita*, 19 n.  
*Dīpa-prakāśa*, 135  
*Dīpa-sāra*, 128 n.  
*dīpti*, 505  
 Docility, 54  
 Doctrinal, 305  
 Doctrine, 28, 43, 50, 55, 86, 192, 195, 196, 297, 330, 334, 338, 340, 346, 349, 406, 422, 427, 430, 434, 472, 483, 484, 512 n., 516, 517, 518, 519, 521, 522, 523, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 539, 546, 548, 550; of *bhakti*, 450; of causality, 276; of *kāla*, 448 n.; of *prakṛti*, 478  
*Dodḍyācārya*, 121 n.  
 Dogmas, 303  
 Domestic life, 62  
 Dormant, 56  
*doṣa*, 165, 175, 184, 188, 238  
 Doubt, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 215, 236, 241, 251; its analysis, 211; its classification, 213; itself indubitable, 236; Nyāya view of it, 207 n.; Veṅkaṭa's conclusive remarks on, 208 *et seq.*; Veṅkaṭa's criticism of Nyāya view, 207-8; Veṅkaṭa's special treatment of it, 207 *et seq.*; Veṅkaṭa's treatment similar to that of Descartes, 202

- Doubtful property, 213  
 Dramatic action, 82  
 Dramiḍa, 108, 139  
 Dramiḍācārya, 105, 106, 107, 108  
 Dramiḍopaniṣad-bhāṣya, 126  
 Dramiḍopaniṣat-tātparyā, 69, 70 n.,  
 71 n., 72 n., 73 n.  
 Draviḍa - śruti - tattvārtha - prakāśikā,  
 127  
 Dravidian, 132, 383 n.  
 Draviḍopaniṣat-sāra, 124  
 Draviḍopaniṣat - sāra - ratnāvalī - vya -  
 khyā, 127  
 Draviḍopaniṣat-tātparyāvalī, 124  
 dravya, 212 n., 251, 343, 484  
 dravyatva, 431  
 Drāviḍa, 63  
 Drāviḍa-bhāṣya, 106  
 Drāviḍa texts, 383  
 Drāviḍa-vedānta, 137  
 Drāviḍācārya, 106  
 Dream, 4, 5, 182, 258, 325, 415, 440;  
 experiences, 5  
 Dreamless sleep, 258, 310, 311, 321,  
 324, 325, 326, 327, 344, 362, 363,  
 364, 411, 412, 420, 443, 453, 467  
 Drunkenness, 169  
 dryāha-pūrve, 530  
 dryāya, 438, 463  
 Dryāvatā-mumāna-nirāsa, 133  
 Dualism, 330, 332, 337, 338, 339, 347,  
 407  
 Dualistic, 352, 406, 486; texts, 422  
 Duality, 4, 37, 154, 218, 344, 375,  
 417, 419, 420, 422, 431, 432, 455,  
 495  
 Duality-texts, 486  
 Dubrenil, Professor, 65  
 duḥkha, 464, 485  
 duḥkha-nivṛttiḥ, 486  
 Dulling, 256  
 Dullness, 328  
 Durupadeśa-dhikkāra, 127  
 Duties, 8, 11, 19, 293, 294, 307, 379,  
 441, 519  
 Dūrārtha-dūrākaraṇa, 131  
 Dvaitā-dvaita, 413  
 Dvaya-churukku, 94  
 Dvayam, 135 n.  
 dveṣa, 470  
 Dvivedin Paṇḍita Vindhyeśvarī Pra-  
 sāda, 1 n.  
 dvayanuka, 263  
 Dvāpara-yuga, 401  
 Dvārakā, 96  
 dvārāntara-nirapekṣa, 277  
 Dvārasamudra, 120  
 Dynamic, 29, 44, 456, 500; agency,  
 446; function, 448 n.; operation,  
 261; power, 448  
 Dynasty, 67  
 Dyutimatī, 98, 100  
 Ear, 167  
 Earliest devotees, 82  
 Early History of Vaiṣṇavism in South  
 India, 64 n., 67 n., 81 n.  
 Earth, 41, 46, 128, 181, 208, 212, 349,  
 393, 447, 500, 506, 521, 540, 541, 550  
 Earth-matter, 342  
 Earth-particles, 188  
 Earth-substances, 188  
 Earthiness, 258  
 Ecstasy, 63 n.; of joy, 376  
 Ecstatic delight, 83  
 Ecstatic experiences, 79  
 Ecstatic joy, 376  
 Eddies, 83  
 Effect, 4, 15, 35, 49, 56, 153, 184, 189,  
 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 199,  
 229, 256, 257, 265, 266, 267, 276,  
 277, 291, 293, 294, 299, 303, 306,  
 332, 339, 341, 342, 343, 344, 359,  
 365, 434, 435, 443, 446, 455, 456,  
 460, 465, 488, 489, 493, 521, 542,  
 543; moment, 272, 273; state, 200,  
 344  
 Effectness, 300  
 Effect-stage, 299  
 Effect-thing, 199  
 Effectuation, 54  
 Efficacious, 28, 29  
 Efficiency, 203, 268, 341, 458, 524, 528  
 Efficient, 203; causes, 301, 386  
 Efforts, 56, 58, 190, 249, 290, 298, 300,  
 304, 333, 374, 475, 503  
 Ego, 13, 42, 56, 144, 208, 211, 257,  
 290, 345, 366, 367, 408, 409, 411,  
 412, 443, 547, 549  
 Ego-consciousness, 362, 367  
 Ego-entity, 325, 362, 408  
 Ego-experience, 334, 366, 368, 370  
 Ego-intuition, 409, 410, 411, 412  
 Ego-notion, 324, 325  
 Ego-substratum, 425  
 Egoism, 325  
 Egoism, 31, 51, 90, 91, 317, 375, 378,  
 379, 408, 468, 470, 485, 494, 505, 529  
 Egoistic desire, 378  
 ekadaṇḍins, 523, 524 n.  
 Ekāśṛṅgatanu, 40 n.  
 ekāntins, 21, 87  
 ekāntitva, 87  
 Ekārṇavaśāyin, 40 n.

- ekātma-rūpa*, 40 n.  
*Ekāyana*, 21  
*Ekāyana veda*, 21  
 Element, 25, 30, 42, 45, 46, 49, 181, 182, 196, 205, 337, 462, 467, 505, 506, 512, 515 n., 519, 521, 522, 527, 541, 542, 544, 545, 547, 550  
 Elementary, 127  
 Emanated, 37  
 Emanation, 37, 198 n., 447, 488, 495  
 Emancipated, 296, 300, 476; souls, 177 n.; stage, 301  
 Emancipation, 29, 32, 50, 52, 57, 61, 62, 71, 88, 136, 143, 145, 146, 159, 161, 177, 292, 293, 294, 295, 304, 314, 316, 324, 326, 327, 336, 364, 365, 366, 371, 374, 382, 383, 384, 388, 408, 412, 414, 420, 421, 429, 433, 442, 445, 446, 450, 453, 457, 460, 463, 476, 477, 479, 483, 485, 486, 487, 488, 491, 494, 495, 506, 509; attainable by God's grace, 304; view of the Nimbārka school of, 420 *et seq.*  
 Embrace, 72, 73  
 Emergence, 45, 48, 196  
 Emergents, 45, 494, 495  
 Emerges, 47  
 Emotion, 29, 82, 83, 377, 450, 451; of love, 79  
 Emotional analysis, 82  
 Emotional stage, 82  
 Emotional transformation, 82  
 Emphasis, 311, 348, 413, 434  
*Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, 523 n., 524 n., 525  
 End, 41, 42, 51, 54, 298, 343, 352, 420, 441, 443, 486, 502  
 Endearment, 90  
 Enemy, 70  
 Energy, 30, 31, 37, 42, 44, 45, 48, 49, 53, 56, 57, 79, 414, 416, 418, 424, 447, 454, 458, 489, 500, 502, 524; of God, 404  
 Enjoyable, 6  
 Enjoyed, 37  
 Enjoyer, 6, 32, 37  
 Enjoyment, 291, 292, 412, 464, 485, 486, 490, 503, 529  
 Enlightened, 80  
 Enlightenment, 53  
 Enquiry, 197  
 Entirely, 194  
 Entirety, 432, 434  
 Entity, 5, 8, 9, 26, 27, 41, 42, 44, 163, 178, 179, 186, 193, 206, 210, 211, 235, 243, 253, 274, 275, 289, 299, 306, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 319, 321, 324, 325, 327, 328, 330, 332, 333, 335, 337, 339, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 351, 352, 353, 389, 408, 410, 416, 421, 423, 425, 439, 436, 439, 440, 448, 451, 457, 463, 464, 474, 487, 497, 503, 504, 506, 507, 539, 541  
 Environments, 30  
*Epigraphia Carnatica*, 104 n.  
*Epigraphica Indica*, 121 n.  
 Epigraphical, 64, 105  
 Epigraphists, 67  
 Epistemological, 9, 80, 467  
 Epithets, 450  
 Epitome, 53  
 Equilibrium, 29, 36, 46, 259, 460, 503, 505, 509  
 Equinox, 295  
 Erroneous, 335; manifestation, 360  
 Error, 179, 180, 182, 185, 186, 187, 210, 240, 241, 253, 307, 330, 334, 337, 346, 383 n., 441, 469, 500; of conception, 398  
 Eschatological, 295, 525  
 Esoteric, 57, 583; doctrine, 134  
 Essence, 28, 31, 35, 329, 345, 393, 413, 415, 424, 426, 431, 433, 434, 436, 442, 445, 449, 455, 461, 490; of intuition, 177  
 Essential characteristic, 151  
 Essential qualities, 70  
 Eternal, 5, 9, 34, 35, 36, 52, 128, 161, 169, 172, 177, 192, 195, 204, 208, 209, 212, 213, 267, 279, 284, 285, 286, 291, 299, 321, 325, 330, 336, 337, 339, 345, 347, 354, 365, 373, 386, 387, 393, 394, 404, 409, 426, 433, 447, 448, 452, 454, 457, 470, 473, 481, 482, 489, 497; bliss, 404; power, 198; world, 80  
 Eternity, 314, 345, 393; of souls, 177 n.  
 Ethical, 525; position, 550  
*Ēlōrembāvāy*, 77  
 Events, 448  
 Evidence, 181, 390  
 Evil, 5, 26, 34, 293, 294, 302, 446, 521  
 Evolutes, 26, 487  
 Evolution, 25, 26, 30, 31, 36, 49, 58, 196, 280, 299, 317, 456, 475, 482, 492, 503, 510  
 Evolutionary, 37, 45, 46, 445, 447, 455, 481; cause, 47; changes, 24  
 Excitement, 61  
 Excommunicated, 20  
 Exercises, 293

- Existence, 31, 33, 41, 42, 50, 51, 182 n., 184, 189, 190, 191, 192, 195, 196, 199, 207, 311, 312, 314, 315, 316, 317, 319, 323, 327, 332, 339, 345, 346, 347, 350, 352, 353, 358, 359, 406, 410, 412, 413, 415, 416, 419, 427, 430, 431, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 442, 443, 445, 454, 455, 459, 464, 476, 477, 489, 497, 507, 509, 518, 533
- Existent, 47, 182 n., 313, 339, 343, 445, 486; entity, 358
- Existent-and-non-existence, 339
- Expansion, 393, 444
- Experience, 8, 9, 29, 34, 41, 45, 79, 83, 87, 142, 152, 166, 170, 178, 182, 185 n., 186, 187, 188, 235, 236, 238, 243, 251, 253, 254, 255, 258, 262, 269, 274, 277, 287, 288, 290, 292, 301, 302, 307, 312, 315, 316, 317, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 334, 344, 347, 360, 363, 364, 370, 383, 398, 413, 414, 415, 420, 421, 437, 441, 443, 444, 445, 448, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 468, 469, 474, 485, 486, 490, 495, 497, 503, 535, 538, 539, 540, 544, 545; treatment of by *Vijñāna Bhikṣu*, 466 *et seq.*
- Experienced, 37
- Experiencer, 37
- Experiency, 168
- Experiential, 185 n.; knowledge, 468, 470, 471
- Expiation, 22, 23
- Explanation, 212, 235, 301
- Exposition, 387
- Expressions, 3, 4, 34, 53, 443
- Extension, 85
- External, 44, 53, 341, 426; data, 253; objects, 189, 204, 205; perception, 426; world, 154, 423
- Extra-mental, 204, 205
- Eye, 167, 182
- Fact, 189, 195, 201, 309
- Factor, 204, 205, 209, 322, 453, 454, 463, 477
- Faculty, 28, 462
- Failure, 535
- Faith, 54, 98, 304, 380 n.
- Fallacies, 128
- False, 4, 153, 155, 157, 173, 174, 180, 181, 188, 194, 198, 208, 210, 235, 252, 254, 291, 293, 296, 306, 307, 312, 313, 314, 315, 317, 324, 325, 326, 327, 329, 332, 333, 337, 340, 341, 343, 350, 351, 364, 371, 397, 406, 407, 408, 418, 424, 433, 437, 438, 440, 457, 470, 485, 486, 543, 549; appearance, 283, 325, 431, 435, 437; association, 186; *avidyā*, 332; effect, 365; imposition, 320, 325; individuality, 376; knowledge, 5, 310, 378, 408, 423, 441, 485, 491, 495; means, 326; notion, 370, 420, 437; perception, 244, 310; things, 371
- Falsehood, 5, 165, 174, 186, 199, 314, 317, 326, 332, 337, 341, 357, 398, 410, 530
- Falsity, 186, 309, 310, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 326, 350, 398, 410, 437, 436, 438, 457, 486; of the world, 199, 239
- Fasting, 33
- Fathomless, 79
- Fault, 70
- Faultless character, 248
- Faulty reason, 178
- Fausboll, 514 n.
- Favour, 51, 159, 160, 164, 303
- Favourable, 292
- Fear, 5, 56
- Features, 46 n., 209
- Feeling, 52, 289, 464; of dullness, 256
- Female lover, 83
- Females, 42
- Filial affection, 83, 89, 90
- Finger-ring, 186
- Finite, 44, 263, 461, 483; forms, 467
- Finiteness, 194
- Fire, 6, 42, 181, 184, 186, 193, 208, 211, 226 n., 295, 447, 451, 461, 484, 499, 500, 534, 536, 538, 540, 549, 550
- Fish, 38
- Fitness, 429
- Five elements, 183
- Flames, 276
- Flow, 442
- Foetus, 44, 287
- Food, 80
- Force, 50, 59
- Forehead, 120
- Forgiveness, 29
- Form, 5, 34, 41, 49, 52, 56, 193, 299, 310, 322, 339, 343, 389, 445, 447 n., 454, 456, 457, 458, 459, 466, 468, 476, 477, 486, 493, 495, 499, 500; of activity, 158
- Formal, 364
- Formless, 10, 193, 197, 310, 332, 447 n.
- Foundation, 475; of *prapatti*, 380 n.; stone, 12
- Fragrance, 27, 221, 222

- Franke, 515  
 Free, 317, 461, 523 n.  
 Freedom, 78, 441, 452, 506; of will, 160  
 Free-will, 45, 292  
 Friendliness, 70  
 Friends, 83  
 Friendship, 87, 375  
 Fructification, 414  
 Fructify, 415  
 Fruition, 32, 33, 265, 291, 303, 443  
 Fruits, 26, 28, 33, 55, 290, 294, 349, 441 n., 444, 445, 454, 488, 489, 504, 506, 521, 522, 548, 550  
 Fulfilment, 29  
 Fullness, 406  
 Function, 36, 37, 38, 49, 56 n., 60, 188, 196, 312, 326, 459, 463, 465, 484, 489, 499 n., 504 n., 530, 548; of *Lakṣmī*, 379  
 Fundamental, 47, 524; tenets, 21  
 Funeral sacrifices, 23  
 Future, 446, 447, 457, 533; lives, 545  
  
*Gadā*, 64  
*Gadya-trayam*, 86 n., 102, 113, 118, 123  
 Gaekwad, 26 n.  
*gandha*, 49 n., 511  
 Gandhamādana, 25  
*gandha-mātra*, 510  
*gandha-tammātra*, 163, 260, 499  
*gandhavattva*, 227  
 Ganges, 520, 525, 550  
 Gaṅgaikondāśodapuram, 96  
 Gaṅgaikondāśola, 96  
 Gaṅgala Bhaṭṭa, 402  
 Garbhopaniṣad, 480  
 Garga, 482  
 Garuḍa, 364  
 Garuḍavāha, 105  
 Garuḍa-vāhana, 64, 94  
*Garuḍa purāṇa*, 450  
*Garuḍopaniṣad*, 13  
*Gauḍa-brahmānandī*, 133  
 Gauḍīya, 13, 50 n.  
 Gauḍīya school, 51, 81, 82, 83; pathological symptoms of love similar to that of the Ārvārs, 83  
 Gauḍīya vaiṣṇavas, 82, 475; their analysis of love follows the analysis of the rhetorical school, 82; their relation with the Ārvārs, 82  
*gauḥ*, 47  
 Gauri, 52  
 Gautama, 96 n., 119  
 Gautami, 447  
 Gaya, 522  
*Gāndhārī*, 59  
*Gāruḍa*, 20  
*Gāyatrī-śata-dāṣaṇī*, 133  
 General character, 185 n.  
 General idea, 445  
 General opposition, 226  
 Generalization, 536, 538  
 Generator, 481  
 Generosity, 520  
 Genesis, 128, 163  
 Genus, 193  
 Germs, 44  
*ghaṭatva-prakāśakam*, 224  
*ghaṭatvāt*, 230  
*ghora*, 499  
 Ghoṣa, 102 n.  
 Gifts, 33, 54, 55, 450  
*Gītā*, 20, 33, 40, 51, 91, 100, 118, 138, 214, 379, 380, 383, 473, 474, 529, 530; heretics referred to, in, 529  
*Gītā-bhāṣya*, 123, 137, 214 n.  
*Gītārtha-saṃgraha*, 98, 99, 100, 123, 131  
*Gītārtha-saṃgraha-rakṣā*, 98 n., 99 n., 123  
*Gītā-saṃgraha-vibhāga*, 131  
*Gītā-sāra-rakṣā*, 131  
*Gītā-tātparya-ḍīpa*, 138  
 Glittering, 181  
 Goal, 50, 445, 508  
 God, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 62, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 78, 79, 83, 84, 85, 86 n., 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 95, 100, 106, 112, 119 n., 125, 128, 129, 132, 135, 136, 182, 189, 190, 192, 196, 200, 203, 225, 232, 261, 286, 291, 292, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 301, 302, 303, 307, 335, 349, 351, 352, 364, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 382, 383, 384, 385, 387, 388, 389, 391, 392, 394, 395, 398, 404, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 420, 422, 424, 426, 428, 429, 430, 431, 434, 437, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 458, 459, 460, 462, 465, 468, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 488, 489, 491, 492, 493, 498, 499, 500, 502, 505, 508, 509, 511 n., 515; Bhāskara's view, 155; His nature in Viśiṣṭa Bhikṣu, 474 et seq.; in Rāmānuja's school, 296 et seq.; in *Vāyu Purāṇa*, 502 et seq.; in

## God (cont.)

- Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, 498 *et seq.*; *Īśvaragītā*, 490 *et seq.*; proof of His existence available only from scriptural testimony, 189; Rāmānuja's view, 155 *et seq.*; refutation of Śaṅkara's view of, 153, 154; refutation of the Nyāya and Yoga view of, 157; theistic proofs, failure of, 189 *et seq.*; Venkata's view of, 157 *et seq.*; Yādavaprākāśa's view of, 156; Yāmuna's view of it, 152 *et seq.*; Yāmuna's ultimate conclusion about, 154, 155
- God Kṛṣṇa, 73
- God, Nimbārka's idea of, 472 *et seq.*
- God Raṅgahātha, 121
- God's grace, 380
- God's manifestation, 392
- God's mercy, 376
- God's relation with man, 70
- Godhood, 50
- Gods, 27, 58, 293, 474, 501, 502, 505, 525; dispute regarding the relative superiority of, 304
- Goḍa, 63
- Gold, 343
- Gomātham Siṭṭiyārvaṇ, 104
- Gomathattut-tiruvinnagar-appan, 97 n.
- gomukha*, 60
- Good, 5, 26, 29, 34, 62, 80, 158, 293, 304, 414, 415, 444, 452, 521, 527; deeds, 523 n.
- Gopalacariyar, 109 n.
- Gopana, 121
- Gopāla Bhaṭṭa, 402
- Gopālasūri, 18
- Gopālatāpam Upaniṣad*, 13
- Gopālatāta, 133
- Gopālācārya, 401
- Gopālotataratāpam Upaniṣad*, 13
- Gopikā, 378
- Gopī, 69, 74, 77, 81, 82
- Gopī-nātha, 96
- Goppanārya, 121 n., 135
- gopītya-varaṇam*, 92
- Goṣṭhipūrṇa, 95, 98, 102, 109
- Gosāla, 522, 523, 524, 525
- Gotama, 235; logic, 234
- gotra, 3
- Government Oriental Manuscripts, 203
- Government Oriental Manuscript Library, 69 n.
- Govinda, 39, 101, 102 n., 109
- Govinda Bhaṭṭa, 100
- Govinda Bhaṭṭācārya, 402
- Govindadāsa, 102 n.
- Govindācārya, 102 n., 111 n., 113 n., 133
- Govindācārya's *Life of Rāmānuja*, 110 n.
- Govindānanda, 107
- Govindārya, 127
- Govindeśa, 109
- Govindāchāryar, 78, 94, 97 n., 105 n.
- Grace, 28, 32, 52, 55, 68, 70, 72, 86, 99, 161, 413, 442, 452; of God, 70, 214 n., 380
- Gradation, 486
- Grandson, 130, 131
- Gantha, 81 n.
- Gratitude, 109
- Grāma-pūrṇa, 102
- Greatness, 99, 195
- Greed, 48, 87, 505
- Greeks, 19
- Grief, 71
- Gross, 24, 31, 46, 47, 48; dimension, 264; elements, 25, 43, 498; objects, 449
- Grossness, 264
- Ground, 190, 192, 196, 334, 338, 420, 423, 431, 454, 456, 464, 490; cause, 197, 456, 486, 488, 493, 494, 495
- Ground-*ajñāna*, 367
- Groundless, 366
- Grow, 447 n.
- Growth, 547
- guḍa*, 226
- guha*, 502
- Guhadeva, 1 n.
- gulma*, 500
- guṇa*, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 34, 36, 37, 42, 43, 45, 46, 56, 147, 148, 156, 157, 212 n., 259, 469, 471, 475, 480, 484, 488, 491, 491, 499, 504, 505, 506, 509
- Guṇa-darpaṇa*, 115 n., 384
- guṇa-guhyā*, 25
- guṇa-potential*, 45
- Guṇaratna, 516, 533
- guṇa* reals, 156
- guṇa-sāmya*, 46
- guṇa-yoni*, 46
- guṇāvatāras*, 40 n.
- Guru, 28, 45
- Guru-bhakti-mandākim*, 403
- Guru-bhāva-prakāśikā*, 115, 127, 131 n.
- Guru-bhāva-prakāśikā-vyākhyā*, 115
- Guru-paramparā*, 64, 65, 66, 94, 95, 112, 121, 399, 400, 401

- Guru-paramparā-prabhāvaṃ*, 64, 94 n., 105  
*Guru-sāmānādhikarāṇya-vāda*, 133  
*Guru-tattva-prakāśikā*, 115, 131  
*Gurūpasatti-vijaya*, 126  
 Guzerat, 63  
  
 Habit, 29, 32, 548  
 Hagiologists, 94, 96  
*haituka*, 517, 518 n., 530  
*haitukān*, 518  
 Halabhūti, 105 n.  
 Halāyudha, 523  
 Hall, 69  
 Hamsa, 40 n., 401  
*Hamsa-saṃdeśa*, 121, 122  
 Happiness, 9, 16, 164, 365, 441, 463, 494, 506, 549, 550  
 Hare's horn, 5, 312, 407, 435, 478  
 Hari, 40 n., 497 n., 500, 508  
 Haribhadra, 533  
 Haribhāskara, 3 n.  
 Harideva, 402  
*Hari-dīna-tilaka*, 122  
 Haridvāra, 94  
*Hari-guṇa-manimālā*, 130  
*Hari-guru-stava-mālā*, 401  
*Harivaṃśa*, 20, 81  
 Harivyāsadeva, 399, 402  
 Harivyāsa muni, 403  
 Harmful, 294, 335; results, 51, 52  
 Harmony, 452, 459  
*Hastigiri-māhātmya*, 124  
*Hasti-jihvā*, 59  
 Hastiśaila, 101  
 Hastyadrinātha, 114 n., 125  
 Hatred, 87  
*Haya-grīva-stotra*, 122  
 Hayaśirṣa, 39 n.  
*Hayaśirṣa-saṃhitā*, 22; its contents, 22  
*Hārda-saṅcaya*, 416  
*Hārta*, 20, 130  
 He, 498  
 Head, 239, 295  
 Heart, 7, 58, 59, 71, 158  
 Heat, 128, 198  
 Heaven, 13, 24, 40, 43 n., 294, 349, 441 n., 447, 514 n., 527  
 Hell, 40, 349, 441 n., 527, 531  
 Helpless surrender, 379, 380  
 Helplessness, 99  
 Hemādri, 20  
 Heretics, 103, 518, 520, 526  
 Heretical views, 531  
 Heterodox view, 531  
*hetu*, 152, 217, 225, 227, 228, 230, 231, 427, 533, 535, 536, 537, 538  
*hetu-sāstra*, 517  
*hetu-vāda*, 517  
*heya-guṇān pratiṣṭhaya*, 175  
 High faith, 380 n.  
 Higher form, 37  
 Highest soul, 61  
 Hill, 208, 211, 534  
 Hindu life, 471; thought, 471; view, 471  
 Hinduism, 516  
 Hindus, 549  
 Hiranyagarbha, 296, 381, 452, 504  
*Hiraṇya-garbha-saṃhitā*, 24  
*hita*, 62  
 Hoernlé, 522, 523, 524 n., 525  
 Holiness, 22  
*Holy Lives of the Āzhvārs*, 78, 94  
 Homogeneous, 307, 332, 396, 397, 432, 462, 463  
*Homoiomeriae*, theory of, 246  
 Honeycomb, 43  
 Hooper, 68 n., 77 n., 78 n.  
 Horse, 167  
 Householder, 103  
 Hoysala, 103, 104, 113  
*hr̥d-yāga*, 60  
*hr̥i*, 62  
 Hṛṣikeśa, 39  
 Human, 444; beings, 191; body, 189; lover, 73; soul, 87, 89, 122, 413  
 Humanity, 70, 71  
 Humbleness, 376  
 Husband, 90  
 Hymns, 69, 99  
*Hymns of the Ālvars*, by J. S. M.  
 Hooper, 74 n.  
 Hyper-logical, 255  
 Hypocrites, 518  
 Hypothesis, 332  
  
*icchā*, 41, 57  
*icchā-śakti*, 42 n.  
*idaṃ vācyam*, 230  
*idaṃ vācyam prameyatuḥ*, 230 n.  
 Idea, 34, 42, 51, 54, 180, 182, 185 n., 205, 206, 210, 300, 317, 352, 353, 412, 439, 440, 441, 451, 455, 466, 472, 473, 490, 494, 496, 544  
 Ideal, 53, 420, 550  
 Idealistic, 205, 253, 546; Buddhist, 238  
 Ideality, 288  
 Ideational, 438  
 Identical, 28, 302, 309, 313, 336, 341, 345, 351, 406, 416, 418, 419, 420, 432, 433, 434, 466  
 Identification, 53, 66, 180, 374, 417, 420

- Identity, 6, 37, 58, 193, 194, 195, 198, 256, 269, 290, 303, 308, 312, 330, 336, 337, 345, 346, 406, 411, 417, 418, 419, 420, 444, 445, 455, 458, 460, 466, 485, 495; of consciousness, 141; texts, 403
- Identity-in-difference, 445
- Idol, 31
- Idā*, 59, 60
- Idu*, 138
- Ignorance, 4, 6, 7, 44, 46, 51, 160, 173, 177, 178, 194, 317, 318, 324, 327, 328, 331, 334, 361, 362, 363, 365, 368, 369, 371, 376, 377, 378, 386, 409, 414, 420, 421, 422, 425, 436, 437, 439, 441, 445, 468, 469, 470, 495, 502, 529
- Ignorant, 51
- Ilāya Perumal, 100
- Illness, 396
- Illumination, 149, 217, 316, 320, 331, 373, 374, 416, 463, 466
- Illusion, 30, 142, 147, 171, 175, 177 *n.*, 179, 180, 181, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 195, 196, 210, 211, 237, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 246, 264, 270, 307, 308, 310, 314, 325, 330, 331, 334, 335, 336, 338, 341, 374, 388, 398, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 418, 422, 423, 425, 426, 438, 439, 440, 441, 457, 467, 491, 539; *akhyāti* and *yathārtha-khyāti* contrasted, 182; Anantācārya's treatment of it, 188; as *akhyāti*, 237; as *akhyāti* refuted by Meghanādāri, 243-4; as *a-nirvacanīya-khyāti*, 238-9; as *a-nirvacanīya-khyāti* refuted by Meghanādāri, 242-3; as *anyathā-khyāti*, 237; as *anyathā-khyāti* and *akhyāti* compared, 244-5; as *anyathā-khyāti* and *yathārtha-khyāti*, 241; as *anyathā-khyāti* refuted by Meghanādāri, 241-2; as dreams, 182; as *nirvāṣaya-khyāti* refuted, 239; as *yathārtha-khyāti*, 237; as *yathārtha-khyāti* and *trivṛt-karaṇa*, 182-3; as *yathārtha-khyāti* supported, 245-6; Buddhist theory of *ātma-khyāti* refuted, 238; condition of, 237; different interpretation—*khyāti*, 237; its relation with maxim of *pratimīdhi-nyāya*, 183; its relation with *trivṛt-karaṇa*, 240-1; Prabhākara's view, 185 *n.*; Rāmānuja's *sat-khyāti* supported by Vādihaṃsāmbuvāha, 183; Sudarśana's comment on the *akhyāti* view, 186 *n.*; Śāṅkarite view criticized by Mādhavamukunda, 422 *et seq.*; theory of *akhyāti* refuted, 180; theory of *anyathā-khyāti*, 179; theory of *anyathā-khyāti* favoured by Rāmānuja and Venkaṭa, 180; theory of *yathārtha-khyāti*, 180; theory of *yathārtha-khyāti* advocated by Bodhāyana, etc., 180; theory of *yathārtha-khyāti* also accepted by Rāmānuja, 180-1; treatment by Vādihaṃsāmbuvāha, 184 *et seq.*; Vādihaṃsāmbuvāha's criticism of *anirvacanīya-khyāti*, 188; Vādihaṃsāmbuvāha's wavering between *akhyāti* and *anyathā-khyāti*, 187
- Illusoriness, 418
- Illusory, 176, 182, 184, 187, 208, 211, 239, 344, 365, 367, 374, 388, 395, 410, 422, 423, 424, 439, 456, 467, 469, 531 *n.*, 537; appearance, 154, 240, 331, 343, 422, 455; Brahman, 422; cognition, 246; construction, 331, 370; entity, 246; experiences, 371; imposition, 320, 331, 333, 423, 438, 440; knowledge, 185; notion, 242; object, 398; percept, 246; perception, 237, 242, 244, 246, 321; relations, 424; series, 177 *n.*; silver, 185 *n.*, 341, 368; world-creation, 339
- Illustration, 209, 311, 326, 334
- Image, 18, 28, 39 *n.*, 41, 182, 185 *n.*, 186 *n.*, 211, 234, 336
- Image-building, 17
- Image-incarnations, 41
- Image-worship, 17, 19, 22, 23, 550; its antiquity, 19
- Imaginary, 419, 423, 446, 477; identification, 81; imposition, 423
- Imagination, 49, 163
- Immanent, 195, 448, 472, 507
- Immaterial, 281
- Immediacy, 367, 439; of succession of, 273
- Immediate, 203, 266, 308, 309, 319, 369; emancipation, 378; intuition, 230, 231, 318, 319; perception, 185 *n.*, 308, 318, 465; realization, 309; reference, 369; succession, 273
- Immortal, 198, 547, 548, 549
- Immortality, 381, 382, 384, 463, 517, 528, 531
- Immutable, 457
- Imparting agents, 357
- Imperfect souls, 430
- Imperfection, 194, 415

- Impermanent, 292  
 Implication, 128, 183, 216, 234, 310, 314, 347, 353, 365, 366, 426, 474, 537, 539  
 Imposed, 182  
 Imposition, 185, 186, 333, 406, 422, 423, 432, 439, 440  
 Impressions, 8, 209, 227, 287, 290, 410, 423, 437, 537  
 Improbable, 404 *n.*  
 Impulse, 44, 452  
 Impulsion, 40  
 Impure, 42, 44, 50, 56, 438, 470; nature, 338  
 Impurity, 46, 51, 54, 80, 156, 505  
 Inactivity, 451  
 Inanimate, 57, 429; creation, 194  
 Incantations, 23  
 Incarnation, 39, 64, 69, 70, 119 *n.*, 302, 472, 475, 482  
 Inclination, 32, 61  
 Incompatible, 325  
 Incomprehensible, 218, 238  
 Incongruity, 269  
 Indefinability, 410, 435, 436  
 Indefinable, 177, 218, 230 *n.*, 239, 243, 316, 340, 410, 436; silver, 242  
 Indefinite, 2  
 Indefiniteness, 370  
 Independence, 51, 54, 55, 455  
 Independent, 443  
 Indescribability, 340  
 Indescribable, 179  
 Indeterminate, 270; cognition, 128; knowledge, 311; matter, 164; perception, 166  
 India, 401  
*Indian Antiquary*, 66 *n.*  
 Indian philosophy, 96 *n.*  
 Indians, 19  
 Indispensable, 180, 201; condition, 180  
 Indistinctness, 254  
 Individual, 30, 190, 193, 206, 211, 232, 287, 289, 291, 303, 323, 370, 377, 403, 413, 414, 416, 417, 429, 431, 433, 434, 441, 443, 444, 451, 452, 459, 462, 485, 492, 493, 494; capacity, 288; cognition, 318, 319, 358; experiences, 82; limitations, 82; self, 79, 170; selves, 335, 370, 413, 426, 464; souls, 2, 6, 7, 26, 38, 56, 158, 159, 176, 190, 191, 194, 198 *n.*, 199, 200, 297, 298, 299, 301, 377, 385, 387, 395, 396, 413, 420, 423, 429, 432, 434, 460, 461, 472, 483; units, 287  
 Individuality, 90, 461  
 Individuation, 462  
 Indra, 295, 528  
*Indra-rātra*, 23  
*indriya*, 300  
 Indubitable, 370  
 Inductive generalization, 536  
 Inert, 408  
 Inexpressible, 179  
 Infatuation, 76  
 Inference, 14, 16, 128, 146, 152, 168, 169, 179, 185 *n.*, 190, 192, 211, 214, 215, 216, 217, 225, 226, 227, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 235, 256, 296, 309, 313, 315, 327, 328, 329, 340, 353, 360, 361, 364, 406, 426, 427, 428, 465, 517, 534, 535, 536, 537, 539; Venkṭa's treatment of it, 225 *et seq.*  
 Inferential, 62, 310, 411; process, 427  
 Inferior, 53, 54  
 Inferred, 341  
 Infinite, 10, 27, 34, 51, 149, 161, 165, 176, 196, 200, 255, 296, 306, 320, 340, 351, 353, 413, 431, 467, 503, 506, 509, 544; individuals, 421; joy, 161; knowledge, 153; nature, 304; regress, 248, 249, 250, 255, 256, 259, 262, 267, 277, 329, 330, 463; series, 177 *n.*; universe, 191  
 Infiniteness, 194  
 Infinitude, 51, 71  
 Influence, 47, 56, 61, 205, 293, 304, 366, 437, 500; of love, 378  
 Influx, 38  
 Inherence, 128, 308, 423  
 Inherent, 261  
 Initiation, 19, 22, 23, 87, 104, 139  
 Injunctions, 14, 123, 124  
 Injury, 61  
 Inner Controller, 27, 39 *n.*, 40, 41, 159, 200, 450, 451  
 Inner dynamic, 47  
 Inner microcosm, 29  
 Inner organ, 172  
 Inquiry, 28, 209, 212, 306, 307  
 Inscriptions, 64, 523  
 Inseparable, 423; characteristic, 150; quality, 150; relation, 222  
 Insignia, 2  
 Insignificance, 54  
 Insincerity, 379  
 Inspiration, 80, 111, 130, 471  
 Inspired persons, 39  
 Installation, 22, 23  
 Instinctive, 287; root-desire, 253  
 Instructions, 25, 38, 413, 550

- Instrumental, 266, 303, 388, 389, 459;  
agencies, 396; agent, 397, 456;  
cause, 2, 204, 266, 301, 388, 389,  
391, 481, 489  
Instrumentality, 247, 308, 391  
Instruments, 191, 204, 205, 336, 470,  
479; of knowledge, 203  
Insult, 173  
Integrity, 405  
Intellect, 295, 304, 465, 547  
Intellectual, 32, 45, 548; operation, 8,  
9; powers, 288; state, 387, 438  
Intelligence, 10, 26, 154, 166, 175, 178,  
192, 193, 483, 537, 548  
Intelligent, 26, 29; being, 191, 192  
Intelligibility, 438  
Intelligible, 419  
Intelligizing, 47  
Intense self-surrender, 89  
Intention, 124  
Interest, 89, 441  
Intermediary, 203, 257  
Intermediate causes, 397  
Intermingling, 181  
Intermixture, 182  
Internal, 426; action, 8; situation, 377;  
structure, 389  
Interpretation, 40, 108, 195, 196, 306,  
351, 471, 475 n., 486, 496, 512, 515,  
516  
Intimate knowledge, 80  
Intoxicated, 79  
Intoxicating, 141; emotion, 377  
Intoxication, 63 n.; 377; by love, 378  
Introspection, 141  
Intuited, 442  
Intuition, 27, 34, 62, 167, 168, 170,  
176, 227, 318, 319, 348, 364, 372,  
409, 412, 442, 464, 465, 538  
Intuitional experience, 175  
Intuitive, 168, 369, 466; experience,  
361; knowledge, 68, 214 n., 216;  
wisdom, 61  
Invalid, 236, 278, 326, 411, 417, 440,  
477, 479, 537; inference, 208; know-  
ledge, 247; propositions, 202  
Invalidity, 201, 202, 248, 347, 348,  
356, 458  
Invariable, 203, 251, 266, 278, 535,  
536, 539; antecedence, 279; ante-  
cedent, 277; association, 226, 538;  
concomitance, 538; priority, 278  
Inverse, 37  
Involution, 37  
*Iraṇḍam-tiru-vantādi*, 134 n.  
Irrational, 177 n.  
Irrationality, 177 n.  
*Itihāsasamuccaya*, 20  
*ittham-bhāva*, 254  
*iyad-guṇaka*, 157  
*ikṣaṇa*, 413  
*Ikṣaty-adhikaraṇa-vicāra*, 133  
*Īśopaniṣat*, 123  
*Īśvara*, 47, 128, 129, 152, 153, 154,  
155, 156, 157, 158, 160, 161, 163,  
225, 335, 443, 446, 473, 474, 475,  
480, 481, 488, 498, 503, 504, 510  
*Īśvara Bhaṭṭa*, 94  
*Īśvara's* body, 157  
*Īśvara-gītā*, 460, 474 n., 482, 494 n.,  
496; its philosophy, 460 *et seq.*,  
482 *et seq.*  
*Īśvara-gītā-bhāṣya*, 285 n., 456 n., 482,  
483 n., 484 n.  
*Īśvara-gītā-ṭīkā*, 450 n.  
*Īśvara-kṛṣṇa*, 30, 478, 501 n.  
*Īśvara-mīmāṃsā*, 124 n.  
*Īśvaramuni*, 94, 97  
*Īśvara-pramādhāna*, 62 n.  
*Īśvara-pūjana*, 61  
*Īśvara-saṃhitā*, 21, 22; its contents, 22  
*Īśvara's* will, 159  
Jacobi, 524 n., 526 n., 528 n.  
*jada*, 452  
Jagannātha, 103, 399  
Jagannātha Yati, 118, 133  
Jaimini, 124, 125, 381  
Jain king, 104  
Jaina, 304, 525, 537; objection, 393;  
view, 537  
*Jaina sūtras*, 524 n., 526 n.  
Jainism, 516  
Jains, 104, 206, 302, 393, 518, 523,  
525 n., 539, 546  
*jalpa*, 512  
*janye-śvara*, 473  
*japa*, 13, 62  
Jaundiced, 182  
Jayanta, 203, 206, 512, 516, 519, 537,  
547, 548  
Jayatirtha, 111  
Jayāditya, 518  
*Jayākhyā*, 21, 22  
*Jayākhyā-saṃhitā*, 24, 25, 26 n., 27 n.,  
28, 29, 30, 31 n., 506 n.; conscious-  
ness how possible, 26; creation as  
Sāṃkhya evolution, 25; emanations  
of Vasudeva in, 29; God-function of,  
29; God, nature of, 27; *guṇa* and  
*avidyā*, 29; knowledge as static and  
dynamic, 29; liberation only possible  
through knowledge of ultimate  
reality, 24; *prakṛti* appears as in-

*Jayākhyā-saṃhitā (cont.)*

telligent, how, 26; *Samādhi*, nature, of, 29; *Sāṃkhya*, difference with, 30; soul, progress of, 28; soul, ultimate realization of, 28; *Suddha-sarga* in, 27; theory of *vāsana*, 26; two kinds of creation in, 25; ultimate reality can be known only through teacher, 25; ultimate reality is beyond the *guṇas*, 25; *yama* and *niyama* in, 29; *yoga*, different ways of, 30; *yoga* leading to final emancipation, 31

Jābali, 529

*jātakas*, 514 n.

*jāti*, 297, 354, 355, 512

*jāti-rūpa*, 216

Jāti-Vādihamśa's conception of it, 354

Jāti-Venkaṭa's conception of it, 355

Jāvali, 530

Jealousy, 87

Jewish Christian, 50 n.

*jijñāsā*, 307

*jijñāsā-darpaṇa*, 115, 392

Jina-hood, 522

*jīva*, 26, 44, 49, 50, 51, 52, 128, 129, 158, 177 n., 187, 193, 194, 208, 301, 329, 330, 336, 346, 407, 418, 443, 444, 451, 453, 476, 486, 493

Jīva Goswami, 496

*jīva-brahma-kya*, 417

*jīvanmukta*, 295, 442

*jīvan-mukti*, 10, 327, 437, 441, 448

*jīva-jñāna-vādi*, 177 n.

*jīvātman*, 498

*jīvātmā*, 483

*jīveśvaraikya-bhaṅga*, 126

*jñāna*, 8, 37, 41, 47, 56, 62, 63, 80, 160, 206, 351, 357, 371, 470, 504, 508

*jñāna-daśā*, 379

*jñāna-guṇāśraya*, 172

*jñāna-janya*, 371

*jñāna-karma-samuccaya*, 307

*jñāna-kriyā*, 148

*jñānaṃ*, 178 n.

*Jñāna-ratna-darpaṇa*, 115 n., 384

*jñāna-rūpa*, 61

*jñāna-samuccita-karma*, 8

*jñānasādhya-vādi*, 371

*jñāna-sāmānya-virodhi*, 352

*Jñāna-sāra*, 102, 110, 138

*jñāna-svabhāva*, 216

*jñāna-svarūpa*, 172

*jñāna-vyāpāra*, 205

*jñāna-viśeṣa*, 161

*Jñāna-yāthārthya-vāda*, 133, 209 n., 210, 241 n., 246 n., 247 n.

*jñāna-yoga*, 22, 33, 34, 89, 91; its meaning, 22

*jñāna-bhāva*, 178 n., 425

*jñāna-karaṇaka-jñānatvam*, 220

*jñātā*, 148

*jñātā*, 411

*jñātyva*, 172

*jñeya*, 28

Joint causality, 197

Joint method of agreement, 536

Joint method of agreement and difference, 542

Joy, 485, 550

Judgment, 210

Judgmental form, 250 n.

Jug, 168, 190, 199, 220, 221, 224, 230, 243, 258, 362, 363, 397

Just will, 78

Justice, 195, 374

*Jyāyan*, 53

*Jyoti*, 499, 510

Kadanmallai, 64

*kainkarya*, 136

Kaiṭabha, 25

*Kaivalya*, 93, 136, 161, 382, 383, 384, 506 n.

*Kaivalya-śata-dūṣaṇi*, 127

Kaiyaṭa, 516 n.

*kalana*, 45

*kalana-kāraṇa*, 47

Kali, 65

Kalijit, 110, 111, 122, 134

*Kali-santarāṇopaniṣad*, 13

Kalivairi, 110

Kalki, 39 n.

Kalkin, 40 n.

*kalala*, 30

Kamalaśīla, 516, 532

Kamalaśīla's *Pañjikā*, 536 n., 540 n., 541 n., 542 n., 543 n.

Kamalā, 114

Kamalākṣa Bhaṭṭa, 100

Kamaṭheśvara, 40 n.

Kambalāśvata, 540

Kampana, 121

Kanikṛṣṇa, 96 n.

Kanjivaram, 119

Kannaḍa, 81 n.

Kaṇāda, 482

Kaṇḍaḍanātha, 98

Kaṇḍādaiyappan, 105

Kaṇṇan, 74 n.

*Kaṇṇinu-śrattāmbu-vyākhyāna*, 127

*Kaṇṇinu-śruttāmbu*, 134 n.

*kapha*, 475

Kapila, 21, 40 n., 479, 482

- Kapyāsa* text, 352  
*Kapyāsam puṇḍarikam*, 101  
*karaṇa*, 280  
 Karimāra, 95  
 Karimāran, 94  
*karma*, 8, 11, 26, 49, 51, 52, 61, 152, 153, 157, 159, 161, 172, 201, 212 n., 258, 291, 292, 293, 295, 301, 349, 366, 375, 383, 385, 386, 393, 409, 411, 412, 413, 443, 444, 445, 446, 448, 452, 453, 454, 481, 484, 487, 489, 508, 509, 520, 522, 523 n., 525, 536, 547, 548, 549, 550; *Vijñāna Bhikṣu*, 452; *Nimbārka's* conception of, 411 *et seq.*; *Nimbārka's* idea of, 414 *et seq.*  
 Karmaharadeva, 402  
*Karman*, 303, 504  
*Karma-yoga*, 22, 33, 34, 89, 91; its meaning, 22  
*kartā*, 387, 411, 510  
*kartṛtva*, 35, 485  
 Karukānātha, 96  
 Kasturī Rāṅgācārya, 381, 383; his general view, 381 *et seq.*; his treatment of the sectarian differences of Baḍgalai and Teṅgalai, 381 *et seq.*  
*Kaṭhu*, 519 n., 528, 529  
*Kaṭha Upaniṣad*, 519  
*Kaṭhavally-upaniṣat-pakāśikā*, 127  
*kathā*, 201, 513  
*Kathā-sarit-sāgara*, 108 n.  
*Kathā-vatthu*, 517  
*Kaṭhopeniṣad*, 379  
 Kattur-ārgiya-vanavalapillai, 110  
*kaumāra-sarga*, 502  
 Kaunḍinya Śrīnivāsa Dikṣita, 384  
 Kauśika-Śrībhāṣya-Śrīnivāsa, 122  
*Kauśitakopaniṣat-prakāśikā*, 127  
 Kautilya, 512, 532  
 Kautilya, *Artha-śāstra*, 512 n.  
 Kavicakravartī Trivikrama, 3  
*Kavilologu*, 121  
 Kavirāja Gopinātha, 482  
 Kavitarikikasimha, 119  
*Kāla*, 36, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 52, 389, 446, 447, 448, 479, 486, 488, 489, 492, 497, 505, 508; different conceptions of, 447; in relation to *Karma*, 448; in *Vijñāna Bhikṣu*, 446  
*kāla-ghaṭa-samyogā-dikam*, 389  
 Kālamukhas, 16  
 Kālanemighna, 40 n.  
*kāla-śakti*, 45  
*kālatraye'pi*, 428  
*Kāma*, 40 n., 62  
*kāma*, as *mīya* and *naimittika*, 293-4  
*Kāma-sūtra*, 550 n.  
*kāmya*, 294  
 Kāntātman, 40 n.  
*kānti*, 57  
 Kāntimatī, 98, 100  
 Kāñci, 63 n., 65, 66, 78, 101, 102, 120  
 Kāñcīpūrṇa, 98, 101, 102, 109  
*kāṇḍa*, 59  
 Kāpālika, 3 n., 16  
*kāraka-cakra*, 206  
*kāraṇa*, 156, 204  
*kāraṇa-brahma*, 474  
*kāraṇam aprameyam*, 502  
*kāraṇānumāna*, 229  
*kāraṇāvasthā*, 200  
*Kārikā*, 440, 501 n.  
 Kāṛi, 65  
 Kāṛimāran, 65  
*kārpānya*, 54, 92  
*kārya*, 4, 189, 265  
*kārya-brahma*, 474  
*kārya-kāraṇā-dhikaraṇa-vāda*, 381 n.  
*kārya-prāga-bhāva-samanvita*, 275  
*kāryādhikaraṇa-tattva*, 132, 381, 384  
*kāryādhikaraṇa-vāda*, 132, 381, 383, 384  
*kāryā-numāna*, 229  
*kāryāvasthā*, 200  
 Kāsarayogin, 63 n.  
*kāśikā*, 518, 518 n.  
*Kāśmīrāgama-prāmānya*, 17  
*Kāśyapa*, 20  
*Kāśyapa-saṃhitā*, 23  
 Kātyāyana, 302, 515, 516; his view of God, 302  
 Kāthaka-siddhāntin, 3 n.  
 Kāveri, 63  
*kāyika*, 507  
 Kerala, 67  
 Kernel, 2  
*Kesara-bhūṣaṇa*, 133  
*Keśava*, 39, 402  
 Keśava Kāśmīrī, 402  
 Keśava Kāśmīrī Bhaṭṭa, 402, 403 n.  
 Keśava Yajvan, 98, 100  
 Keṭṭi ammaṣ, 104  
*kevalā-nvayi*, 228, 229, 230, 427; inference, 230  
*kevala-vyatireki*, 226, 227, 229, 230, 231, 232, 427  
*Khaṇḍana-khaṇḍa-khāḍya*, 201, 535 n.  
*khyātis*, 184, 410, 503, 510  
*khyāty-ayogāt*, 243  
 Kidāmbi Rāmānuja Pillan, 110  
 Kidāmbi-Tirumalai-Nayinār, 137  
 Kilaiyagattārvār, 95

- kīlciit-kara*, 277  
*Kīśoradāsa Pandit*, 399, 404  
*kīrti*, 57  
*kleśa*, 44  
 Knots, 437  
 Knower, 172, 315, 325, 326, 333, 411, 423, 466, 467, 468, 489, 507  
 Knowing relation, 250 n.  
 Knowledge, 4, 7, 8, 9, 28, 29, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 41, 47, 49, 51, 54, 91, 129, 146, 176, 178, 179, 181, 184, 185 n., 187, 188, 193, 204, 205, 206, 210, 238, 250 n., 292, 293, 295, 300, 307, 308, 309, 310, 312, 317, 318, 321, 323, 324, 325, 327, 328, 329, 335, 336, 340, 346, 347, 348, 352, 357, 361, 369, 371, 386, 409, 410, 411, 412, 418, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 430, 436, 437, 440, 443, 445, 449, 453, 461, 462, 465, 466, 467, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 479, 481, 482, 485, 486, 488, 490, 491, 492, 493, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 506, 507, 508, 533, 537, 547; and the known, 423; its self-validity, 247 *et seq.*  
 Known, 466  
 Kolli, 67  
 Kollikavaladasar, 137  
 Koluttuṅga I, 103, 104  
 Koluttuṅga II, 104  
 Koṇḍinna, 115  
 Kōṅgu, 67  
 Koyilkaṇḍaiaṇṇan, 111  
*Krama-dīpikā*, 403  
 Kratu, 21  
*kraurya*, 376, 379  
*kriyamāṇa karma*, 443  
*kriyā*, 36, 37, 41, 51, 57  
*kriyākhyā*, 29, 44  
*kriyākhyā-jñāna*, 29  
*kriyā-śakti*, 42  
 Kroḍātman, 40 n.  
*kr̥kara*, 59  
*Kṛmikantha*, 104, 105  
*Kṛpācārya*, 401  
*Kṛṣṇa*, 38, 39 n., 40 n., 69, 70, 71, 72, 74 n., 77, 80, 81, 82, 83, 121, 304; 378, 401, 405, 442 n., 474, 475; his life, 83  
*Kṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭa*, 401  
*Kṛṣṇadeśika*, 18, 137  
*Kṛṣṇamaṅgala*, 96  
*Kṛṣṇa Miśra*, 531 n., 532  
*Kṛṣṇapāda*, 110, 111, 118, 134, 135  
*Kṛṣṇapāda-lokaguru*, 131  
*Kṛṣṇa-samāhbbhaya*, 110  
*Kṛṣṇa-stava-rāja*, 400  
*Kṛṣṇasūri*, 111, 112  
*Kṛṣṇatātācārya*, 123, 131  
*Kṛṣṇopaniṣad*, 13  
*Kṛtakoti*, 105 n.  
*Kṛtamālā*, 63  
*kṛtsnā-jñāna-prattis tāvad asiddhā*, 361  
*Kṛttikā*, 279; constellation, 229  
*kṣamā*, 57, 61  
*Kṣamā-śoḍaśi-stava*, 111  
*kṣana*, 274  
*kṣaṇa-dvaya-sambandha-śūnyatva*, 273  
*kṣaṇa-kāla-sambandhatvaṃ*, 273  
*kṣaṇa-kālatvaṃ*, 273  
*kṣaṇa-mātra-vartitva*, 273  
*kṣaṇa-sambandhitva*, 269  
*kṣaṇa-pādhitvaṃ*, 274  
*Kṣattriya*, 64  
*Kṣetra*, 31, 32, 502, 504  
*Kṣetrajña*, 31, 498, 503  
*Kṣetrajña-śakti*, 51  
*kṣobha*, 498  
*kṣobhaka*, 509  
*kṣobhya*, 498, 509  
*Ku-dṛṣṭi-dhvānta-mārtaṇḍa*, 396, 397 n.  
*kuhu*, 59  
*kukkuṭa*, 60  
*Kula-sekhara*, 64, 66 n., 67, 68, 69, 76, 82, 134  
*Kula-śekhara Peru-māl*, 63, 65, 66, 96 n.  
*Kula-śekharaṅka*, 66, 67  
*Kulārka*, 229  
*Kumāra*, 401  
*Kumāra-Vedānta-deśika*, 111, 122  
*Kumāra Vedāntācārya*, son of Veṇkaṭa, 123, 126; his works, 125  
*Kumārila*, 8, 148, 205, 347, 348, 357  
*Kumbakonam*, 68, 73, 95, 103, 116 n.  
*Kumbha-koṇa Tātayārya*, 126, 127  
*kuṇḍala*, 67, 416, 434  
*Kuṇḍalint*, 36  
*Kuṇḍali*, 58  
*Kuṇḍali-śakti*, 58  
*Kurakā*, 95  
*Kuranātha*, 102  
*Kureśa*, 98, 102, 103, 104, 109, 110, 111, 113, 114, 134; his contribution in writing *Śrībhāṣya*, 103; his eyes put out, 103  
*Kureśa-vijaya*, 113 n.  
*Kurugai-kkaval-appan*, 98  
*Kurukā*, 98  
*Kurukanātha*, 98  
*Kurukeśvara*, 109  
*Kurukur*, 68  
*Kuruttalvan*, 66, 102

- Kuruttama, 66  
 Kuvera, 39  
 Kuyil, 77  
 Kūrma, 39 n., 40 n., 59, 60, 475  
 Kūmapurāṇa, 19, 20, 480, 482, 483, 488, 496, 502 n., 509, 510, 511 n.; philosophical elements in, 509 *et seq.*  
 kūṣastha, 49, 484  
 kūṣastha puruṣa, 50  
  
 Laghu-bhāgavatāmṛta, 40 n.; avatāras in, 40 n.  
 Laghu-bhāva-prakāśikā, 129  
 Laghu-māñjuṣā, 403  
 Laghu-prakāśikā, 116  
 Laghu-sāmānādhikarāṇya-vāda, 133  
 Laghustava-rāja-stotra, 403  
 lakṣaṇā, 306  
 Lakṣmanārya-siddhānta-saṃgraha, 130  
 Lakṣmī, 36, 41, 45, 52, 53, 56, 57, 70, 99, 100 n., 157, 375, 379  
 Lakṣmī Dāśarathi, 98  
 Lakṣmī-devī, 115  
 Lakṣmīnātha, 96  
 Lakṣmī-tantra, 39 n., 56 n., 57, 379  
 Lakṣmītantra, avatāras in, 39-40 n.  
 lakṣya, 340  
 Lamentation, 72, 73  
 Lamp, 25, 444  
 Laṅkā, 82  
 latā, 500  
 Laugākṣibhāskara, 3 n.  
 laukika, 426  
 laukiki, 507  
 Law, 412, 448, 474; of Excluded Middle, 242; of Contradiction, 242  
 lāghava, 180  
 Legendary account, 83  
 Legendary life, 81, 83  
 Legendary lovers, 81  
 Legendary personages, 81, 82  
 Lesser gods, 475  
 Letters, 4  
 Liberation, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 24, 39, 170, 173, 257, 450; during lifetime, 10  
 Life, 41, 293, 327, 420, 443, 461, 471, 509, 519, 521, 522, 526, 530, 531, 536, 545  
 Life-force, 59  
 Life-functions, 7  
 Life-history, 82  
 Life-movements, 548  
 Life of Rāmānuja, 113 n.  
 Light, 46, 178, 198, 280; and heat, 163  
 Light-heat-potential, 48, 260  
 Light-potential, 163  
 Limitation, 194, 195, 432  
 Limited, 292; sense, 43; time, 285  
 Lineage, 3, 129, 132  
 Linee di una storia del Materialismo Indiano, 512 n.  
 Linguistic, 218; usage, 239, 282  
 Liṅga, 16, 22  
 Liṅga-purāṇa, 20  
 liṅga-śāstra, 487  
 Literary, 69  
 Literature, 43, 56, 58, 112, 531  
 Living, 456  
 hlā, 51, 158  
 hlā-vatāra, 40 n., 475  
 Location, 41  
 Locus, 58, 283, 290, 328, 351, 417, 435, 437; its negation, 255; of subsistence, 397; of the negation, 283  
 Logic, 119, 235, 236, 533; depends on admission of objective realities, 236; in Bengal, 133  
 Logical, 80, 111, 183, 194, 442, 513; apparatus, 256; argument, 113; categories, 236; criticism, 154; doctrine, 550; implications, 184; proof, 313; situation, 341  
 Logically valid, 236, 253  
 Logicians, 517, 518  
 Loka, 513, 514  
 Lokabhāskara, 3 n.  
 loka-khāyikā, 513  
 Lokanātha, 40 n.  
 loka-pitāmaha, 503  
 loka-saṃgraha, 92  
 Lokācārya, 110, 122, 134, 136, 137, 155, 157, 160, 163, 260, 374, 380, 381; his views, 136  
 lokācārya-tad-anubandhinām, 381 n.  
 Lokācārya I, 134, 135  
 Lokāyata, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 519, 526, 530, 532, 533; its significance, 512 *et seq.*  
 lokāyata doctrines, 528, 529, 532  
 lokāyata view, 532  
 Lokāyata-śāstra, 515, 531, 533  
 Lokāyatika, 512 n., 527, 529, 548  
 lokaṣu āyata, 515  
 Loneliness, 79  
 Longings, 70  
 Lord, 22, 27, 31, 33, 41, 42, 44, 50, 51, 53, 54, 56, 83, 87, 88, 307, 412, 430, 508  
 Lord (Bhagavān), 21  
 Lord Kṛṣṇa, 99  
 Lost objects, 89  
 Lost soul, 88  
 Lotus, 58, 153, 271

- Love, 136, 294, 376, 377, 414, 450, 451, 472, 491; stricken, 378  
 Love-sickness, 83  
 Lover, 70, 83, 84, 377  
 Loving embraces, 73  
 Lower caste, 93  
 Lower form, 37  
 Lower order, 88  
 Lowliness, 54  
 Lucidity, 79  
 Lump of clay, 46, 259, 332; of salt, 10  
 Lunar, 295  
  
 Madan Mohan Library, Benares, 399  
 Madhu, 25, 47  
 Madhura-kavihr̥daya, 124  
 Madhura-kavi, 69  
 Madhura-kaviy-āṅvār, 63, 64, 65, 66 n., 67, 94, 95, 134 n.  
 Madhurantakam, 103  
 Madhusūdana, 39, 40 n.  
 Madhva, 111, 112, 113, 125, 304, 305, 387, 399, 400, 401, 403, 475, 496  
 Madhva-mukha-mardana, 399, 400  
 madhya, 58  
 madhyama, 505  
 Madhya Pratoli Bhāṭṭārya, 109  
 madhyastha, 201  
 Madhya-vīthi Bhāṭṭārya, 109  
 Madras, 69 n., 94 n., 104 n., 106 n.  
 Madras Govt. Oriental MS., 239 n.  
 Madras Presidency, 64  
 Madura, 65, 67, 120  
 Magical creation, 394  
 Magician, 335  
 Mahadyogin, 63  
 mahat, 46, 47, 63 n., 163, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260 n., 446, 473, 475, 489, 490, 499, 502, 504, 507, 509, 510, 511  
 mahātman, 504  
 mahat prajñā, 503  
 mahattattva, 475, 480, 489, 498  
 Mahābhārata, 12, 17, 19, 20, 21, 40 n., 260 n., 379, 443 n., 447, 479, 517, 530, 531, 532; Nara and Nārāyaṇa in, 12; reference to heretics in, 530  
 Mahācārya, 117, 125, 127, 130, 131, 135, 305, 361, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 370, 371, 373; his works, 125, 126  
 Mahādevī, 98  
 mahā-kalpas, 525  
 Mahālakṣmī, 41, 67 n.  
 mahāmoha, 500  
 mahām, 503, 504  
 Mahānada, 63  
 Mahānadi, 63  
 Mahāpūrṇa, 98, 100, 101, 102, 103, 109, 139  
 Mahā-puruṣa-nirṇaya, 98, 99 n.  
 mahā-pūrva-pakṣa, 175 n.  
 Mahārāṣṭra, 63  
 Mahārya, 63 n., 96  
 Mahā-saṇatkumāra-saṃhitā, 23, 37  
 mahā-siddhānta, 175 n.  
 Mahā-vidyā doctrines, 229  
 mahā-viśvāsa, 54  
 Mahā-viṣṇu, 56, 507, 508  
 Mahāvīra, 522, 524 n., 525 n.  
 Mahāyāna, 1 n.  
 Maheśvara, 39 n., 473, 497 n., 506, 509 n.  
 Mahomedans, 121, 135  
 Maintenance, 38, 51, 52, 56, 195, 196, 454  
 Maitrāyaṇīya Upaniṣad, 531 n.  
 Maitreya-paṇiṣad, 480  
 Maitrī Upaniṣad, 447  
 Majesty, 35, 136  
 Makkhali, 522  
 Makkhali Gosāla, 522; his views, 522  
 Makkhaliputta Gosāla, 525 n.  
 Males, 42  
 Malik Kafūr, 120  
 Mallipura, 63 n.  
 Mal-observation, 279  
 Mamallai, 65  
 mamatva, 506  
 mamātmā, 140  
 Manakkal, 67 n.  
 Manakkal-lambej, 97  
 manana, 405, 422  
 manas, 8, 9, 13, 25, 38, 48, 49, 56, 57, 80, 139, 142, 144, 148, 151, 153, 158, 163, 191, 257, 258, 280, 281, 499, 503, 504, 506, 507, 509, 510  
 Manavalamahāmuni, 110  
 manda, 505  
 Mandangudi, 69  
 Mandates, 441  
 Manhood, 70  
 Manifest, 36  
 Manifestation, 4, 17, 26, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39 n., 40 n., 42, 44, 45, 47, 51, 53, 57, 150, 163, 198, 215, 218, 247, 250, 265, 267, 311, 336, 338, 355, 356, 359, 360, 361, 365, 367, 373, 387, 412, 447, 449, 451, 473, 487, 497, 498, 500, 508, 524  
 Manifested condition, 156  
 Manifesting, 39; power, 41  
 Manifold, 32, 197  
 Maṇi-sāra-dhikkāra, 122  
 Maṇiśideva, 402

- mankha*, 522, 524 n.  
 Mankhali, 523  
 Mankhaliputta Gosāla, 522  
 Man-lion, 38  
 Manner, 60  
*mano-doṣāt*, 185 n.  
*manomaya*, 57  
*mantā*, 510  
*mantras*, 13, 22, 23, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31, 57, 58, 60, 69, 102, 403  
 Manu, 1 n., 14, 17, 21, 146, 479, 515, 518, 519; denies the *Pañcarātrins*, 14  
*manus*, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 56, 57  
*Manu-saṃhitā*, 16  
 Manuscripts, 119, 126, 135, 138, 305, 346, 399  
 Manu Vaiśvasvata, 40 n.  
*Maṅgala-dīpikā*, 126  
 Maṅgācārya, 127 n.  
 Maṅgācārya Śrīnivāsa, 118  
 Maṇavāla, 94 n.  
 Maṇavāla Mā-muni, 64, 65, 137  
*maṇi-pravāla*, 64, 105, 123, 137, 138  
 Maraner, 98  
 Maraner Nambi, 98  
 Marici, 21  
 Mark, 17, 20, 524 n.  
 Marriage, 69  
 Marudha-grāma-pūrṇa, 102, 110  
*Maskarin*, 523, 524 n.  
 Masters, 83  
 Material, 10, 25, 26, 29, 49, 181, 189, 190, 208, 288, 388, 389, 418, 449, 481, 495; cause, 2, 37, 46, 55, 188, 196, 197, 266, 286, 301, 302, 341, 342, 365, 385, 388, 389, 397, 404, 454, 459, 465, 500, 543; changes, 301; element, 489; energy, 459; forms, 37; identity, 252; impurities, 384; part, 301; products, 527; stuff, 329  
 Material world, 181, 194, 199, 200, 291, 297, 384, 385, 416  
 Materialistic, 512  
 Materialists, 550  
 Materiality, 195, 256, 383  
 Maternal grandfather, 122  
 Maternal uncle, 109, 183  
 Mathuradeva, 402  
 Mathurā, 94, 96, 103, 120  
*mati*, 47, 57, 61, 503, 510  
*Matsya*, 39 n., 40 n., 475  
*Matsya Purāṇa*, 16, 479  
 Matter, 26, 49, 125, 157, 193, 200, 211, 299, 406, 430, 431, 434, 435, 457, 458, 459, 465, 492, 495, 501, 519; Venkata's view of it, 162 *et seq.*  
 Matter-stuff, 385  
*maṭha*, 103, 104, 111  
 Maxim of determining similarity by real representation, 183  
*mayāra*, 60  
 Mayilai, 64  
 Mādhava, 39, 103, 110, 127, 400, 532, 533, 632  
 Mādhavadāsa, 109, 110  
 Mādhava Mukunda, 416, 420, 426, 437; controversy with the monist, 416 *et seq.*; his criticism of *jīva-brahmai-kya*, 417; his criticism of Rāmānuja and Bhāskara, 429 *et seq.*; his criticism of Śāṅkarite *ajñāna*, 424 *et seq.*; his criticism of Śāṅkarite emancipation, 420 *et seq.*; his criticism of the category of "difference", 417 *et seq.*; his criticism of the theory of illusion of Śāṅkara, 422 *et seq.*; his refutation of the falsity of the world, 435 *et seq.*; his treatment of *pramāṇas*, 426 *et seq.*  
 Mādhavācārya, 2  
*mādhyaṃika*, 201, 238, 340  
 Mādhyaṃika Buddhists, 238  
*Mādhyaṃika-pakṣa*, 177  
 Māheśvara, 3 n., 505  
*māheśvara yoga*, 505  
*mākhali*, 522  
 Mālādhara, 98, 109  
*mānasa-pratyakṣa*, 220, 359, 361, 538  
*mānasika*, 507  
*mānavas*, 49  
*Māna-yathātmya-niṣṭhaya*, 119, 128 n., 216, 229, 234  
*Māṇḍūkyopaniṣat-prakāśikā*, 127  
 Māṇikka-vāchakara, 84  
 Mārāṭhā, 3  
*Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*, 501 n., 502 n., 506; philosophical treatment in, 506  
*Mārkaṇḍeya-saṃhitā*, 24  
 Māra, 65  
 Māraṅkāri, 65  
 Māraṇ-jadaiyan, 65  
*Māhara vṛtti*, 448  
*māyā*, 1, 2, 4, 5, 26, 29, 42, 52, 100 n., 129, 132, 165, 196, 197, 198, 334, 335, 336, 383, 393, 396, 410, 412, 424, 434, 440, 454, 457, 472, 476, 485, 486, 491, 492, 494; in *Īśvara-gītā*, 497; in relation to *pradhāna* as treated by Viśṇāna Bhikṣu, 476 *et seq.*  
*Māyā-kōśa*, 38  
*Māyāvāda*, 484  
*māyāvādin*, 4, 443

- māyāvi*, 472  
 Meals, 105  
 Meaning, 195, 233  
 Meaningless, 99  
 Means, 55, 298, 310  
 Measure, 264  
*medhā*, 57  
 Medhātithi, 515, 518 n., 519 n.  
 Mediate knowledge, 425  
 Mediate process, 247  
 Meditation, 10, 11, 22, 23, 30, 31, 32, 39, 40 n., 41, 42, 58, 60, 69, 80, 137, 219, 292, 293, 295, 364, 388, 405, 414, 415, 437, 442, 446, 450, 451, 465, 474  
 Medium, 449  
 Meghanādāri, 111, 114, 115, 125, 214, 215, 216, 217, 229, 234, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243; adopts only *yathārtha-khyāti*, 241, 245, 246, 247 n., 248, 249, 346, 348, 349; arguments in favour of validity of knowledge, 247; his admission of five *pramāṇas*, 216; his admission of *upamāna*, 234; his arguments in favour of *yathārtha-khyāti*, 245-6; his conception of various categories connected with conception, 218 *et seq.*; his definition of perception, 217; his refutation of *akhyāti*, 243; his refutation of *anirvacantya-khyāti*, 242-3; his refutation of *anyathā-khyāti*, 241-2; his refutation of *nirviśaya-khyāti*, 246; his refutation of objections against self-validity, 248-50; his refutation of the Nyāya view of *parataḥ prāmāṇya*, 347; his treatment of memory, 214 *et seq.*; his treatment of nature validity, 215-16; his treatment of object, 217; his treatment of perception in relation to validity, 215-16; his view of *karma* and fruits, 349; his view of perception contrasted with that of Rāmānuja, 218; his view of *svataḥ-prāmāṇya-vāda*, 346; his view that intuition is self-valid, 348; his view of time, 348; his works, 125; *pramāṇa* and *artha-pariccheda-katva*, 240; supports *arthā-patti*, 234-5  
 Melody, 80  
 Melukot, 104, 113  
 Melaiyagattārvār, 95  
 Memory, 5, 8, 128, 150, 151, 167, 168, 178, 180, 181, 184, 185 n., 186 n., 209, 210, 214, 215, 216, 220 n., 223, 234, 239, 245, 249, 250, 268, 287, 348, 360, 363, 364, 376, 410, 420, 545, 548, 549; its treatment by Venkaṭa and Meghanādāri, 214-15; its validity, 237  
 Memory-image, 244, 245, 247  
 Memory-knowledge, 248  
 Mental, 204, 205; intuition, 359, 361; modes, 364; organs, 445; perception, 426, 538; powers, 47; process, 185 n., 539; state, 310, 334, 339, 372, 373, 439, 465, 469, 470, 495, 540, 541, 543, 544, 545; temperament, 543  
 Merciful, 54, 374  
 Mercy, 78, 85, 99, 292, 375, 413, 474; of God, 374, 375  
 Merit, 15, 153, 191, 453, 520  
 Meritorious, 521; actions, 294  
 Messengers, 83  
 Metals, 41  
 Metaphysical, 237; position, 451; views, 450  
 Metaphysico-cosmological theory, 246  
 Metaphysics, 550  
 Method, 55, 183, 195; of agreement, 228, 356  
 Microcosm, 26  
 Microscopic, 390  
 Mind, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38, 48, 54, 60, 152, 172, 182, 189, 191, 192, 207, 209, 291, 294, 295, 308, 420, 423, 427, 434, 440, 442, 444, 490, 498, 505, 527, 542, 543; contact, 202; substance, 194  
 Minimum assumption, 186 n.  
 Minor, 427; gods, 22; term, 533, 534, 535  
 Minor Religions, 81 n.  
 Minor Religious Systems, 64 n., 399  
 Minority sect, 20  
 Miraculous, 505; power, 30, 60  
 Mirage, 282, 369  
 Mirror, 27, 144, 208, 211, 334  
 Misapprehension, 182, 183, 185, 251  
 Mis-association, 245  
 Misconception, 456  
 Mis-correspondence, 357  
 Mis-perception, 418  
 Misery, 28, 87, 164, 295, 302, 303, 308  
 Mistake, 5  
 Mistress, 75, 377  
 Mīśra, 139  
*mīśra-varga*, 57  
*mīśra-varga-sṛṣṭim ca karoti*, 38  
*Mīta-prakāśikā*, 115  
*mitāhāra*, 61  
 Mithilā, 112

- Mithyātva-khaṇḍana*, 133  
 Mitra, Dr Rajendra Lal, 400  
*Mīmāṃsā*, 107, 108 n., 124, 247, 357, 350, 358, 539  
*Mīmāṃsakas*, 15, 347  
*Mīmāṃsaka* school, 205  
*Mīmāṃsā-pādukā*, 124  
*Mīmāṃsā* theory of error as non-discriminating memory-image and perception refuted, 247  
*Mīmāṃsā-sūtra*, 7 n., 107 n., 108 n., 124, 125  
*Mīmāṃsists*, 152, 429, 518, 536  
*mleccha*, 93, 441 n.  
 Mode, 42, 53, 194, 419; of syllogism, 364  
 Modification, 2, 3, 4, 6, 80, 183, 260 n., 299, 323, 367, 423, 435, 454, 455, 459, 463, 468, 471, 495, 503  
*moha*, 464, 500  
*mohana*, 46  
*mohātmaka*, 256  
*mokṣa*, 62, 71, 523 n.  
*Mokṣa-dharma*, 260 n.  
*Mokṣa-kāraṇatā-vāda*, 133  
*Mokṣa-siddhi*, 118, 352  
 Molecular, 206  
 Molecule, 183, 262  
 Moment, 47, 273, 277, 285, 286  
 Momentariness, 252, 268, 269, 272, 274  
 Momentarists, 271  
 Momentary, 268, 270, 275, 284; entities, 270; unit, 268, 269  
 Monetarist, 273  
 Monetary, 273  
 Monism, 4, 176, 308, 316, 320, 340, 371, 391, 477, 490, 495  
 Monist, 100, 106, 129, 416, 419  
 Monistic, 101, 196, 422, 486, 495; doctrine, 197, 477, 480; identity, 336; interpretation, 351, 417; texts, 5, 352, 406, 431; view, 406  
 Monotheistic, 13; God, 43 n.  
 Moon, 42, 59, 210, 228, 295, 310, 340, 447, 537  
 Moral, 29, 32, 33, 472, 501, 549; apprehension, 32; freedom, 472; heroes, 88; responsibility, 291, 533; sphere, 273; values, 457, 460  
 Morality, 303, 516, 533  
 Mother's breast, 77  
 Motion, 206  
 Motivation, 44  
 Motive, 54, 293, 294  
 Motor organs, 543  
 Mouth, 59  
 Movement, 44, 45, 53, 56, 189, 210, 446, 449, 481, 493, 504  
*mṛd-dravya*, 258  
*mṛttva*, 258  
*mṛtyu*, 447  
 Much, 494  
 Mud, 397  
 Mudal-āṅvārs, 68 n.  
*Mudal-tiru-vantādi*, 134 n.  
*mugdha*, 328  
*mukta*, 60  
*mukti*, 11, 50, 51, 89, 487  
*Mukti-darpaṇa*, 115 n., 384  
*Mukti-śabda-vicāra*, 127  
 Mukunda, 425, 426  
*Mukunda-mālā*, 66, 67, 80 n.  
*Mumukṣu-ppaḍi*, 135 n.  
*Mumukṣū-pāya-saṃgraha*, 114 n., 125  
 Mundane, 16, 34, 41, 295, 452; bondage, 414; forms, 40; gods, 38; life, 43 n., 292  
*Muni-vāhana-bhoga*, 124  
*Munṛām-tiru-vantādi*, 134 n.  
*Muṇḍakopaniṣat-prakāśikā*, 127  
 Muttering, 23; of mantras, 62  
 Mutual agreement, 201  
*mūḍha*, 499  
*mūla*, 46  
*Mūla-bhāva-prakāśikā*, 115, 117, 126  
*mūla-doṣāpekṣā*, 177 n.  
*mūla-dhāra*, 58  
*mūrdhanya-nāḍi*, 295  
 Mysore, 113, 121, 124 n.  
*Mysore Gazetteer*, 104 n.  
 Mystic, 53; cognition, 168  
*Mysticism and Logic*, 539 n.  
 Mythical, 364, 550  
 Mythological, 25  
 na, 476  
*na cai'kyam nāśa-bādhayoh*, 239  
*Nacchīyār*, 69  
 Naciketa, 119  
 Naḍaḍur Ammal, 110  
 Naḍaḍur Ārvān, 104  
*naimittika*, 293, 294, 502, 503  
*naimittika pralaya*, 502  
 Naināracārya, 111  
*Naīśadhacarita*, 549  
 Naiyāyikas, 146, 152, 155, 211, 219, 221, 225, 230, 233, 262, 263, 264, 265, 280, 291, 300, 347, 355, 358, 359, 393, 518, 539, 546  
*Nakṣatra-mālikā*, 138  
*namaḥ*, 53  
 Nambi, 67 n., 100  
 Nambilla, 110

- Namburi Varada, 110  
 Namburi Varadārya, 110, 111  
 Namburi Varadarāja, 134, 135  
 Names, 3, 4, 34, 47, 48, 209, 457, 544  
 Nāmm'-āṣvār, 63, 64, 65, 66, 68, 69, 74, 78, 79, 83, 94, 95, 98, 110, 134  
 Nandagōpāl, 77  
 Nandivarman, 67  
 Nanjiar, 110, 134, 135  
 Nan-mukham Tiru-vantādi, 68  
 Nappinnāi, 77, 81  
 Nara, 12, 40 n.  
 Naraharideva, 402  
 Narasiṃha, 40 n.  
 Narasiṃha-sūri, 122  
 Narasiṃhavarman I, 65, 67  
 Narasiṃhiengar, Mr M. T., 134 n., 138  
 Narcotic, 79  
 Nasik, 3  
 Natesan and Co., 104 n.  
 natthi, 520  
 natthika, 520  
 natthika-dīp̄thi, 520  
 nātthikavāda, 521  
 Natural, 51; omniscience, 214 n.  
 Nature, 35, 42, 44, 45, 46, 50, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57, 100 n., 128, 146, 166, 180, 193, 195, 197, 206, 253, 256, 306, 310, 315, 317, 325, 331, 334, 344, 350, 389, 407, 408, 411, 413, 414, 415, 420, 428, 431, 439, 442, 448, 499, 450, 461, 466, 483, 485, 545; of Lakṣmī, 375; of soul, 79  
 Navaratna-mālā, 135 n.  
 Nava-vidha-sambandha, 135 n.  
 Navel, 58  
 Navel-wheel, 59  
 Navyaraṅgeśa, 122  
 Naya-dyu-maṇi, 114 n., 115, 116, 125, 215 n., 216 n., 217 n., 219 n., 220 n., 234 n., 239 n., 242 n., 243 n., 245 n., 247 n., 346, 347 n., 348 n., 349 n., 392  
 Naya-dyu-maṇi-dīpikā, 115, 116, 392  
 Naya-dyu-maṇi of Naya-dyu-maṇi-dīpikā, 115  
 Naya-dyu-maṇi-saṃgraha, 115, 116, 392  
 Naya-kulīśa, 118  
 Naya-mālikā, 116 n.  
 Naya-maṇi-kalikā, 130  
 Naya-mukha-mālikā, 114, 116, 133  
 Naya-prakāśikā, 114, 346  
 Naya-vīthi, 186 n.  
 nābhi-cakra, 59  
 Nācchīyār-īrumōḷi, 134 n.  
 nāda, 58  
 nāḍi, 59, 60  
 nāga, 59  
 Nāgārjuna, 307, 522  
 nāga-vāyu, 60  
 Nāl-āyīra-divya-prabandham, 64, 66, 69, 77  
 Nāl-āyīra-prabandham, 69  
 nāmadheya, 4  
 nāma-dheyam, 3  
 nāma-saṅkīrtana-rataḥ, 96  
 Nām-mukam, 134 n.  
 Nārada, 13, 25, 40 n., 401; his journey to Sveta-dvīpa, 13  
 Nāradya, 20  
 Nāradya-purāṇa, 507, 508 n.; philosophical elements in, 507  
 Nārāyaṇa, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19, 21, 39, 40 n., 42 n., 68 n., 86, 89 n., 100 n., 101, 126, 128, 129, 132, 136, 157, 304, 352 n., 375, 379, 401, 474, 475, 482, 507, 511 n.; alone, 126; as highest God, 12; associated with Pañcarātra, 12; his worship in the Sveta-dvīpa, 13  
 Nārāyaṇadeva, 402  
 Nārāyaṇa muni, 116, 131  
 Nārāyaṇa Śarmā, 404  
 Nārāyaṇīya, 40 n., 443 n.  
 Nārāyaṇopaniṣad, 13  
 Nāstika, 512, 517, 518, 519, 525, 527; its significance, 517 et seq.  
 Nāstika cārvaṇka, 512 n.  
 nāstikaśāstra, 515  
 Nāthamuni, 66, 67 n., 85, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 119, 180, 181 n., 233, 235; he practised aṣṭāṅga yoga, 96 n.; his life, 94 et seq.  
 Nāthas, 525 n.  
 nātha-vādins, 525  
 Negation, 5, 169, 186, 202, 214, 230, 232, 243, 255, 271, 272, 283, 312, 314, 327, 330, 331, 332, 339, 342, 344, 351, 352, 353, 354, 412, 420, 424, 428, 431, 445, 467, 476; antecedent to being, 279; of occupation, 282; of vācyatva, 230 n.  
 Negation-precedent-to, 328, 330, 351; production, 338, 341, 344, 345, 353, 369  
 Negative, 181, 183, 186, 187, 252, 343; causes, 354; characters, 170; concept, 282; concomitance, 229; entity, 341; instance, 228, 229; means, 376; pain, 364; qualifications, 323; relation, 231  
 Nerve, 59, 295  
 Nervous system, 58

- Nescience, 177, 311, 316, 361, 362,  
 441, 442, 460, 465  
*neti*, 431  
 Neutral datum, 253  
 New knowledge, 184  
 New measure, 264  
*nididhyāsana*, 405, 442  
*nidrā*, 57  
*Nigamaparimala*, 124  
*nigraha*, 51  
*nigrahasthāna*, 512  
 Nihilism, 177, 269, 307, 320, 332, 334,  
 419  
 Nihilist, 350, 520, 533  
 Nihilistic, 520, 521; Buddhists, 201;  
 philosophy, 177 *n.*; sect, 533  
*nihsambandhaḥ*, 11  
*niḥsvabhāva*, 356  
*Nikāśa*, 123  
*Nikāya*, 524  
*Nikṣepa-rakṣā*, 122  
 Nimba, 399  
 Nimbapura, 399  
 Nimbāditya, 399, 400, 401  
 Nimbārka, 399, 400, 402, 403, 404,  
 405, 409, 420, 422, 424, 426, 427,  
 428, 433, 434, 440, 472, 497, 506;  
 his *bhāṣya*, 400; his conception of  
*ahankāra*, 411 *et seq.*; his conception  
 of *ajñāna*, 404 *et seq.*; his conception  
 of *karma*, 411; his criticism of Sañ-  
 kara, 409 *et seq.*; his idea of *avidyā*,  
 414; his idea of God, 412 *et seq.*; his  
 idea of *karma*, 414 *et seq.*; his philo-  
 sophy, 400, 404 *et seq.*; his works,  
 400-2; Nature of self, 411 *et seq.*;  
 school, 401, 408, 440; system, 413;  
 teachers and pupils of the school,  
 379 *et seq.*; view, 430  
*Nimbārka-matam*, 401  
 Nimbārkiists, 410, 411, 434, 440  
*nimitta*, 2, 388, 456  
*nimitta-kāraṇa*, 157, 191, 398  
*nimitta-kāraṇatā*, 396  
*nimittamātram*, 500  
 Nineteenth century, 188  
*Ninru kumirume*, 78  
*nir - adhiṣṭhāna - bhramā - nupapattiḥ*,  
 238  
*niranvaya-vināśa*, 274, 276  
*nirapekṣatayānanda*, 36  
*niravayava*, 201  
*nirbharatva*, 86  
*nirgranthas*, 523  
*nirguṇa*, 25  
*nirhetuka*, 85  
*Nirvāṇa*, 28  
*nirvikalpa*, 217, 219, 220, 221, 224,  
 270, 311, 544; knowledge, 544  
*nirvikalpa jñāna*, 221  
*nirvikalpa-pratyakṣa*, 166, 223  
*nirviśeṣa*, 165, 195  
*nirviśeṣa caitanya*, 420  
*Nirviśeṣa-pramāṇa-vyudāsa*, 133  
*nir-viśaya-khyāti*, 239, 246  
*niṣkala*, 31  
*niṣkramya*, 527  
*niṣprapañca brahman*, 10  
*nitya*, 36, 293, 294, 502  
*nitya-rāṅgitva*, 87 *n.*  
*nitya-sūratva*, 88 *n.*  
*nivartaka*, 61  
*niyāta*, 165  
*niyama*, 29, 33, 61, 62 *n.*, 509 *n.*  
*Niyamānanda*, 399, 403  
*niyati*, 42, 43, 45, 57, 448 *n.*  
*Nilameghatātācārya*, 133  
*nila-paṭa*, 527 *n.*  
*Nīla*, 41, 42, 57  
*nirūpa*, 238 *n.*  
*Nīti*, 235  
 Noble qualities, 70, 71  
 Non-appearance, 365  
 Non-apprehension, 180, 181, 182, 183,  
 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 237, 284  
 Non-being, 239, 312, 314, 456, 457,  
 509  
 Non-Buddhists, 514  
 Non-dependence, 37  
 Non-difference, 487  
 Non-different, 484  
 Non-discrimination, 247  
 Non-distinction, 449, 491  
 Non-duality, 488  
 Non-earthiness, 227  
 Non-eternal, 199, 208, 209, 212, 213,  
 386, 446, 470, 478  
 Non-eternality, 386  
 Non-eternity, 394  
 Non-existence, 27, 177, 211, 229, 235,  
 344, 410, 428, 435, 436, 473, 476,  
 478, 507  
 Non-existent, 5, 47, 177, 266, 284, 327,  
 339, 344, 407, 423, 433, 436, 440,  
 445, 457, 477, 486  
 Non-existing, 184  
 Non-illumination, 314  
 Non-illusory, 246  
 Non-living, 456  
 Non-material, 146, 171  
 Non-materiality, 171  
 Non-mundane, 39  
 Non-observation, 279, 334  
 Non-occupiedness, 164

- Non-perception, 128, 182, 207, 241, 342, 351, 426  
 Non-performance, 523  
 Non-physical, 548  
 Non-production, 449  
 Non-relational, 455  
 Non-sensible, 354  
 Non-sentient, 54  
 Non-spiritual characteristics, 172  
 Non-substance, 251  
 Non-vedic, 15, 16, 17, 19  
 Normal caste, 379  
 Normal duties, 92, 380  
 North India, 63, 523  
 Northern India, 103  
 Nothingness, 36  
 Notices, 400 n.; of *Sanskrit Manuscripts*, 403  
 Notion, 297, 298, 300, 310, 324, 337, 341, 343, 349, 351, 353, 418, 443, 538, 542; of validity, 248  
 Not-self, 409  
 Not-silver, 183  
 Nṛsimha, 39 n., 40 n.  
 Nṛsimhadeva, 122, 123  
 Nṛsimharāja, 123, 131  
 Nṛsimha-rājya, 122  
 Nṛsimhasūri, 131  
 Nṛsimha-tāpini Upaniṣad, 13  
 Nṛsimhārya, 109, 110  
 Nṛsimhottara-tāpini Upaniṣad, 13  
 Nuns, 104  
 nūkhya varga, 502  
 N.W. Provinces Catalogue, 400  
 Nyagrodhaśāyin, 40 n.  
 nyāsa, 55, 90, 131  
 Nyāsa-kārikā, 380  
 Nyāsa-tilaka, 122, 125, 131, 380  
 Nyāsa-tilaka-vyākhyā, 122, 125, 380  
 Nyāsa-vidyā-bhūṣaṇa, 132  
 Nyāsa-vidyārtha-vicāra, 133  
 Nyāsa-vidyā-vijaya, 127  
 Nyāsa-vimśati, 122, 380  
 Nyāsavivṛti, 131  
 Nyāya, 9, 128, 131, 153, 154, 157, 203, 204, 206, 207 n., 208, 212 n., 234, 235, 262, 263, 300, 358, 471, 517, 538; categories, 539; logic, 226; objection, 249; refutation of the doctrine of whole and parts by Veṅkaṭa, 263 *et seq.*; Veṅkaṭa's refutation of atomic theory, 262 *et seq.*  
 Nyāya-bhāṣaka, 133  
 Nyāya-kulīta, 118, 128 n., 184, 186 n., 250 n., 251 n., 352, 353 n., 354 n., 355 n., 356 n., 357 n., 358 n., 360 n.  
 Nyāya-kusumāñjali, 1, 539 n.  
 Nyāya-mañjari, 203, 204 n., 205 n., 206 n., 513 n., 516, 519, 535 n., 536 n., 538 n., 539, 540 n., 547, 548  
 Nyāya-pariśuddhi, 96 n., 119, 123, 125, 127, 128 n., 131, 180, 202 n., 208 n., 209 n., 210, 213 n., 216 n., 219 n., 220 n., 222 n., 223 n., 225 n., 226, 227 n., 228 n., 232 n., 233 n., 234 n., 235, 236 n., 237 n., 239 n.  
 Nyāya-pariśuddhi-vyākhyā, 131  
 Nyāya-ratnāvali, 131  
 Nyāya-sāra, 123, 127, 128 n., 202 n., 203 n., 222 n., 223 n., 237 n., 238 n.  
 Nyāya-siddhāñjana, 117, 123, 126, 128 n., 157 n., 251, 259 n., 261 n., 280 n., 297, 382, 383 n.  
 Nyāya-siddhāñjana-vyākhyā, 117, 126  
 Nyāya-sudarśana, 119 n., 128 n.  
 Nyāya-sūtra, 76 n., 208, 211-12, 300 n., 512, 513, 517, 539  
 Nyāya-tattva, 96, 119, 128 n., 233, 235  
 Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, 162, 471  
 Nyāyāmṛta-taraṅgiṇī, 138  
 Nattva-tattva-vibhūṣaṇa, 133  
 Nattvopapatti-bhaṅga, 133  
 Natva-candrikā, 131  
 Natva-darpaṇa, 115  
 Natva-tattva-paritrāṇa, 129  
 Object(s), 30, 33, 41, 47, 49, 50, 178, 179, 181, 182, 184, 185 n., 189, 190, 205, 206, 210, 244, 280, 289, 297 n., 298, 307, 309, 311, 312, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 343, 347, 348, 351, 415, 419, 423, 426, 427, 439, 442, 444, 457, 458, 466, 467, 474, 477, 500, 506, 544; its matter according to Veṅkaṭa and Meghanādāri, 217; of awareness, 231, 318, 319; of knowledge, 241, 243; of perception, 246, 346  
 Objection, 298, 299, 303, 308, 315, 316, 317, 320, 321, 333, 343, 392, 408, 409, 417, 418, 422, 437, 477, 537  
 Objective, 53, 58, 179, 182, 490; awarenesses, 238; cognition, 9; entities, 188, 247, 360, 362; factors, 236; world, 246  
 Objectively, 182 n.  
 Objectivity, 315, 325  
 Obligatory, 441; duty, 124, 137, 293  
 Observation, 209, 257  
 Obstacles, 33  
 Obstruction, 183, 282, 449, 466, 481  
 Obstructive attitude, 376  
 Occasion, 47, 60  
 Occasionalism, 159

- Occupation, 282  
 Occurrence, 205  
 Ocean, 52, 301, 302, 304, 445, 447, 450, 451, 452  
 Odorousness, 212 n.  
 Odour-potential, 48  
 Offering, 23, 550  
 Older school, 91, 92  
 Omnipotence, 24, 51, 200, 450, 462, 472  
 Omnipotent, 10, 11, 15, 34, 303, 443; being, 336  
 Omniscience, 24, 50, 51, 158, 195, 198, 200, 432, 433, 472, 506  
 Omniscient, 9, 11, 27, 44, 152, 303, 318, 335, 405, 430, 443  
*Omākāra-vādārtha*, 392  
 Ontological, 118, 180, 185 n., 195, 497; argument, 231  
 Ontologically, 180  
 Openings, 59  
 Operation, 45, 46, 56, 185, 204, 205, 206, 267, 297, 312, 318, 329, 331, 411, 412, 413, 423, 427, 433, 446, 448, 459, 460, 470, 475, 547  
 Opinion, 93, 210  
 Opponent, 116 n., 230, 249  
 Opportunity, 292  
 Opposites, 230  
 Opposition, 208  
 Order, 49, 58, 195  
 Ordinary, 43; methods, 58; personality, 82  
 Organ, 48, 490  
 Organic, 151, 455  
 Organs of sight, 182  
 Origin, 212, 466, 468, 490; of *Bhakti* in *Bhāgavata-māhātmya*, 63; of knowledge, 543  
 Original, 42, 58; course, 396  
 Origination, 321  
 Oscillation, 264  
 Otherness, 351  
*Oudh Catalogue*, 400 n.  
  
*Padma*, 20, 60  
 Padmalocana Bhaṭṭa, 98  
 Padmanābha, 39, 110, 118  
 Padmanābhācārya, 401  
 Padmanābhārya, 352, 361  
*Padma Purāṇa*, 484, 507, 532  
 Padmapurāṇa, reference to *Bhakti* in, 507  
*Padma Saṃhitā*, 23  
*Padma-tantra*, 39 n., 42 n.; *avatāras* in, 39 n.  
 Padmācārya, 401  
  
 Padmākara Bhaṭṭa, 401  
 Pain, 146, 148, 171, 189, 256, 259, 290, 301, 302, 344, 349, 412, 427, 442, 449, 463, 464, 485, 486, 489, 490, 493, 494  
 Painful, 256, 289, 415, 416, 452  
 Pairs, 42  
*pakṣa*, 231, 427, 534, 535  
*pakṣadharmā*, 534  
 Palar, 63  
 Pallava king, 67  
 Pallavamalla, 65  
 Pallava-maṭha, 137  
 Pallavas, 65, 67  
 Pamphlet, 123, 124  
 Panar, 64, 69  
 Panentheism, 497  
 Pangs, of love, 72; of separation, 73; of sorrow, 70  
 Pantheism, 497, 498  
 Pantheistic, 498  
*pañcama*, 15, 17.  
*Pañca-pādikā-vivaraṇa*, 196, 197 n., 198 n.  
 Pañcarātra(s), 2, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 38 n., 40 n., 42 n., 50, 56, 57, 58, 62, 103, 105, 122, 125, 132, 157, 303, 379, 448 n., 471, 475; antiquity of, 12; conflict between Brahminic authorities about, 19; contents of, 18-19; doctrine, 503; instructed by God, 14; its antiquity, 19; its ideal different from the Vedas, 17; its relation with the Vedas, 18; its validity attested in *Puruṣa-nirṇaya* of Yāmuna, 16; not polytheistic, 17; originated how, 21; *Purāṇas* that are favourable and unfavourable to it, 20; *puruṣa-sūktā*, associated with, 12; regarded as *tantra*, 18 n.; relation with the Vedas, 12; religion, 20; rituals not non-Vedic, 17; sacrifice, 12; texts, 13; valid as the injunction of God, 14; worship, 19  
 Pañcarātra literature, 18, 21, 24; its validity attested by Yāmuna, 10; works enumerated, 21 *et seq.*  
*Pañcarātra-rakṣā*, 18, 122  
*Pañcarātra-rakṣā-saṃgraha*, 18  
*Pañcarātra-saṃhitā*, 12 n., 155  
*Pañcarātra-śāstra*, 21  
*Pañcarātrins*, 14, 19, 20; denounced in *smṛti* and *Purāṇa*, 19-20; identical with *Bhāgavatas* and *Sātvatas*, 15; possess a lower stage, 15  
*pañca-saṃskāra*, 102

- Pañcādhyāyī-śāstra, 3 n.  
 Pañcāgni-vidyā, 382, 384  
 Pañci-karaṇa, 182, 237, 240  
 Pañjikā, 131  
 Paṇḍita, 94, 130, 177 n.  
 para, 41, 42, 489  
 para-brahma, 474, 509  
 Parakāla, 63  
 Parakāladāsa, 111  
 Parakāla Yati, 115, 117, 126, 127, 305  
 para-loka, 518, 548  
 Parama, 32  
 Parama-pāda-sopāna, 124  
 Parama-saṃhitā, 22, 24, 32, 33; Bhakti, rise of, in, 33-4; its contents, 22; karma and jñāna-yoga in, 33; karma-yoga and jñāna-yoga in, 22; vairāgya, nature of, in, 33; yoga in, 32  
 Para-mata-bhaṅga, 123, 124, 128 n.  
 Parama-tattva-nirṇaya, 23  
 paramārtha, 165, 378  
 paramātman, 7, 34, 445, 451, 452, 453, 487, 489, 502  
 parameśvara, 89, 475, 489  
 Parameśvara-saṃhitā, 23  
 Parameśvarvarman II, 65  
 parameśthin, 447  
 Paranda-paṇi, 135 n.  
 Para-pakṣa-giri-vajra, 403, 414 n., 416, 417 n., 418 n., 425 n., 428 n., 429 n., 430 n., 431 n., 432 n., 433 n., 434 n., 435 n., 437 n., 440 n.  
 Paraśurāma, 38, 40 n., 429  
 Paraśurāmadeva, 402  
 parataḥ pramāṇa, 9  
 parataḥ-prāmāṇya, 248, 249  
 para-tantra-sattvā, 430  
 Para-tattva, 24  
 Para-tattva-dīpikā, 122  
 Para-tattva-nirṇaya, 138  
 Para-tattva-prakāśa, 23  
 Para-tattva-prakāśikā, 127  
 Paravastu Prativādirbhayaṅkara Anṇa-yācārya, 111  
 Paravādirbhayaṅkara, 112  
 parā, 509  
 parā-kāśatva, 88 n.  
 parāmarśa, 225, 427  
 Parāṅkuśa, 65, 78  
 Parāṅkuśa-pūrnārya, 102 n.  
 Parāntaka, 67  
 Parāntaka Cola I, 96  
 Parāntaka, King, 65  
 Parāntaka Paṇḍya, 65  
 parārthānumāna, 427  
 Parāśara, 134, 260 n., 479  
 Parāśara Bhaṭṭa, 235  
 Parāśara Bhaṭṭāraka, 119  
 Parāśara Bhaṭṭārya, 102 n., 104, 109, 110, 134, 135  
 Parāśara purāṇa, 19  
 Parāśara saṃhitā, 22; its contents, 22-3  
 parātman, 486  
 Parents, 70  
 Parikara-vijaya, 131, 361  
 parimāṇa, 254, 264, 397  
 parimita-gambhīra-bhāṣṭrā, 108  
 pariṇāma, 6, 106, 197  
 pariṇāma kāraṇa, 365  
 pariṇāmi kāraṇa, 365, 366  
 pariṇāmi-rūpa, 484  
 paritrāṇa, 40  
 parokṣa, 62  
 parokṣa-vṛtti, 425  
 Part, 30, 49, 178, 189, 191, 192, 194, 195, 262, 286, 291, 295, 300, 301, 307, 308, 312, 408, 409, 411, 422, 430, 432, 433, 434, 444, 447 n., 453, 456, 462, 464, 475, 493, 494  
 Particles, 263, 264; of consciousness, 141  
 Particular, 193, 299, 537; proposition, 202  
 Partless, 201, 263, 306, 358, 365, 422, 432, 548; atoms, 263; real, 372  
 Paryamka, 30  
 Passionate lover, 82  
 Passionate yearning, 83  
 Passions, 32, 51, 54, 317, 318, 488  
 Past, 182, 446, 447, 457, 533; experience, 184, 185 n.  
 paśyantī, 58  
 Patañjali, 61 n., 62, 239, 444, 470, 473, 479, 480, 515, 516, 518, 523; his Mahā-bhāṣya, 516 n.  
 Patañjali-sūtra, 478  
 Paternal affection, 158  
 Path, of bhakti, 380 n.; of knowledge, 39; of right, 61; of virtue, 158  
 Pathological symptoms, 83  
 Paths of duties, 91  
 Paṭṭars, 104  
 paurāṇic, 482  
 Paurāṇic emotionalism, 451  
 pauraṣa, 30  
 Pauṣkara, 21, 22  
 Pauṣkara-saṃhitā, 23, 24  
 Payasvintī, 59, 63  
 Pazhanadai-vilakkan, 94 n.  
 Pādukā-sahasra-nāma, 122  
 Pāli, 512, 513 n.; texts, 514  
 Pāli Dictionary, 520

- Pali-English Dictionary, 513  
 Pāñcarātrikas, 3 n.  
 Pāṇḍya, 65, 67, 98  
 Pāṇini, 108 n., 516 n., 518, 523  
*pāramārthika*, 313  
*pāramārthiki*, 371  
*pāratantrya*, 87  
*Pārāśara*, 20  
*Pārāśarya*, 125  
*Pārāśarya-vijaya*, 117, 305  
*Pārāśaryya-vijayā'di-pūrvā'cārya-pra-bandhā-nusāreṇa*, 128 n.  
*Pārijāhara*, 40 n.  
*Pārijāta-saurabha*, 406 n.  
*pāśaṇḍi*, 518  
*pāśaṇḍino*, 518  
*Pāśupata*, 3 n., 16  
*Pāśupata-tantra*, 155  
*Pātālasayana*, 40 n.  
*Pāvaka*, 39  
*Pela Puradeśika*, 132  
 Penance, 13, 24, 29, 34, 160  
 People, 43 n.  
 Perceivability, 438, 439  
 Perceived qualities, 252  
 Perceiver, 284, 315, 321, 398, 547  
 Percept, 185 n.  
 Perception, 14, 80, 128, 141, 151, 152, 166, 168, 174, 177, 179, 181, 182, 184, 185, 187, 188, 199, 202, 208, 210, 211, 212, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 220, 221, 222, 224, 237, 241, 242, 252, 254, 268, 269, 270, 280, 284, 306, 307, 310, 311, 312, 313, 315, 324, 326, 327, 328, 334, 343, 351, 353, 356, 368, 390, 398, 406, 412, 426, 427, 465, 472, 533, 537; its definition, 216-17; *saṁkalpa* and *nirvikalpa*, 220-4; treatment by Venkaṭanātha and Meghanādāri, 216 *et seq.*; view on, by later members of the Rāmānuja school, 220 *et seq.*  
 Perceptual, 79, 309, 411; cognition, 250 n.; evidence, 298; experience, 320, 326, 327, 328, 390, 536; knowledge, 212, 326; form, 246  
 Perfect, 295; knowledge, 50  
 Perfection, 31, 122, 194  
 Performance, 33, 293, 530  
*Periya-jīyar*, 94 n., 110, 111, 137  
*Periyalnāmbi*, 103  
*Periya Nambi*, 67 n.  
*Periyar*, 63  
*Periya-tiru-maḍal*, 69, 134 n.  
*Periya-tirumoli*, 134 n.  
*Periya-tiru-moṛi*, 69  
*Periya-tiru-muḍiy-aḍavu*, 64, 105  
*Periya tiru-vantādi*, 69, 134 n.  
*Periy-ārvār*, 63, 64, 65, 66 n., 68, 69, 77  
*Periy-ārvār-tirumoṛi*, 134 n.  
*Periy-ārvār-tiruppalāṇḍu*, 134 n.  
 Permanent, 144, 198, 291, 343, 541, 546; world, 198 n.  
 Permāḍi, 66  
*per se*, 431  
 Person, 49, 189, 191, 401, 472  
 Personal continuity, 143  
 Personal effort, 378  
 Personal God, 472  
 Personal identity, 142  
 Personal service, 104  
 Personality, 49, 100 n.  
 Peru-māl, 64, 134 n.  
 Peru-māl Jīyar, 64  
 Perumāl Temple, 523  
*Perumāl-tirumoli*, 134 n.  
*Peru-māl-tiru-moṛi*, 69  
 Pervasive entities, 263  
 Pessimism, 550  
 Pey, 68  
*Pey-ārvār*, 63, 64, 65, 66 n., 68 n., 134 n.  
*Phala-bheda-khaṇḍana*, 125  
 Phenomena, 205, 238, 340, 365, 407, 456  
 Phenomenal, 454; world, 155, 164  
 Phenomenalism, 238, 285  
 Phenomenon, 142, 180, 266, 272, 302, 467, 542  
 Philosopher, 202, 449  
 Philosophical, 120, 126, 181, 305, 307, 364, 395, 525; doctrines, 22; elements, 24; importance, 21; reality, 377; speculation, 79; topics, 23; wisdom, 89  
 Philosophy, 34, 107, 112, 119, 195, 235, 305, 319, 413, 445, 471, 472, 482, 496, 508 n., 512, 513  
 Phraseology, 196  
 Phrases, 309  
 Physical, 205, 310, 530; elements, 547; practices, 60  
 Physico-biological, 298  
 Physics, 515 n.  
 Physiological, 530; change, 140  
 Pictorial, 455  
 Piece of iron, A, 26  
 Pilgrimage, 55, 120  
 Pillai Lokācārya, 110, 111, 120, 134, 135, 137, 138  
 Pillai Lokamjīyar, 105  
 Pillai Lokācāryar, 64  
 Pillar edict, 522  
 Pillān, 66

- Pinb'-aragiya, 64  
 Pinb'-aragiya Perū-māl Jiyar, 94 n., 105  
*Piṅgalā*, 59, 60  
 Pioneers, 84  
 Pirān, 63  
 Piszzagalli, Dr, 512 n.  
*pitṛ-yāna*, 517  
*pitta*, 475  
 Pity, 52  
*Piṅgarūli-ceyalare-rahasya*, 135  
 Pīyūsharaṇa, 40 n.  
 Place, 185 n.  
 Playful, 51  
 Pleasurable, 46, 256, 289, 415, 416, 452; ends, 294  
 Pleasure, 71, 146, 148, 154, 171, 189, 256, 259, 282, 290, 291, 292, 301, 302, 303, 304, 326, 349, 365, 412, 427, 442, 444, 449, 463, 464, 470, 485, 486, 489, 490, 493, 494, 513, 528, 550  
 Plurality, 165, 174, 194, 264, 398  
 Poetry, 68, 121  
 Point, 192, 195, 209, 416  
 Poison, 364  
 Polemic, 403  
 Polemical discussions, 305  
 Polemical work, 123  
 Political science, 515  
 Polity, 515, 532  
 Pollution, 303  
 Pontifical, 111; chair, 134  
 Pope, 84 n.  
 Position, 194, 195, 331, 339, 349, 352  
 Positive, 178, 183, 186, 187, 252, 323, 343, 351, 362, 441; *ajñāna*, 364, 365; bliss, 136; category, 243; defects, 331; entity, 164, 177, 271, 272, 282, 317, 327, 339, 341, 345, 353, 354, 424; experience, 238, 282; ignorance, 330, 332, 336; inference, 329; instances, 230; means, 376; moment, 272; nescience, 361, 362; perception, 363; pleasure, 294; proposition, 229; state, 344; stuff, 332, 364  
 Positivity, 282  
 Possibilities, 207  
 Posture, 30, 60  
 Potency, 347  
 Potential, 35, 37, 266, 445, 461; effect, 266; form, 50, 56; power, 541  
 Pots, 453  
 Potter, 453  
 Potter's wheel, 342  
 Power, 35, 41, 42, 43, 44, 46, 50, 51, 52, 53, 56, 57, 60, 136, 153, 155, 184, 190, 193, 197, 301, 441, 445, 471, 473, 475, 477, 500, 505, 506, 509, 524, 540, 548  
 Poygaiy, 64, 68, 523  
 Poygaiy-ārṇār, 63, 65, 66 n., 68 n., 134 n.  
*Prabandham*, 67  
*prabandhas*, 91  
*Prabandha-sāra*, 94 n.  
*Prabandha-sāram*, 66  
 Prabhācandra, 206, 516  
 Prabhākara, 181, 185 n.; his view, 185 n.  
*prabhā-tadvatoriva* 416  
*Prabodha-candro-daya*, 122, 531 n., 532  
*prabuddhi*, 510  
 Practical, 265, 458; behaviour, 4, 466; conduct, 5; experiences, 341, 371; philosophy, 22  
 Practice, 29, 30, 31, 33, 293  
*Pradhāna*, 25, 34, 472, 475, 476, 477, 478, 485, 489, 492, 497, 498, 502, 505, 506, 509  
*Pradhānā-śataka*, 124  
*pradhvaṃśa-bhāva*, 353  
 Pradyumna, 13, 37, 39, 42, 43, 52, 56, 57, 157, 158, 443 n., 475; stage, 57  
*pragalbha nāstika*, 526, 527  
 Pragmatic value, 335  
*prajāpati*, 48, 295, 447, 528  
*prajñā*, 47, 503, 510  
*Prajñānidhi*, 126  
*Prajñā-paritrāṇa*, 119, 128 n., 208, 212, 214 n., 234  
*Prakaraṇa-pañcikā*, 185 n., 186 n.  
*prakāra*, 156  
*prakāśa*, 358, 373, 416  
*Prakāśa-saṃhitā*, 23  
 Prakāśātman, 196, 197, 198 n.; criticized by Rāmānuja, 197; his view of relation between *māyā* and Brahman, 198 n.  
*Prakāśātmanā*, 25  
*prakṛti*, 24, 25, 26, 28, 30, 31, 32, 34, 36, 38, 43, 45, 46, 47, 49, 56, 57, 61, 144, 147, 156, 158, 163, 164, 172, 173, 239, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260 n., 261, 266, 280, 296, 301, 381, 384, 444, 445, 446, 449, 453, 454, 455, 456, 459, 460, 463, 464, 469, 472, 473, 474, 476, 477, 479, 480, 481, 482, 484, 485, 486, 487, 489, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 498, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509  
*prakṛti-prasūti*, 502

- pralaya*, 13, 36, 56, 156, 169, 446, 459, 477, 481, 493, 502, 503  
*pramā*, 62, 203, 467  
*pramāṇa*, 62, 125, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 214, 215, 216, 234, 235, 236, 239, 240, 247, 248, 249, 346, 351, 361, 390, 423, 426, 427, 428, 468, 469, 503 n., 537, 539; as *artha-paricchedakatva*, 240; Buddhist view of it, 205; difference between Rāmānuja Nyāya and Śāṅkara, 204; difference of view regarding it between Veṅkaṭa and Meghanādāri, 240; Jaina view, 205; Jayanta's view, 203; Kumārila's view, 205; Meghanādāri's definition of, 239; refutation of it by Śrīharṣa, 201; Vātsyā-Śrinivāsa's treatment of it, 203; Veṅkaṭa's definition, 236; Venkata's treatment of it, 201 *et seq.*  
*pramāṇa-phala*, 205, 467  
*Pramāṇa-saṃgraha*, 20  
*Pramāṇa-sāra*, 133, 138  
*Pramāṇas*, treatment by Mādhava Mukunda, 426 *et seq.*  
*pramāṇārtha*, 62  
*pramātā*, 368  
*pramātṛ-tattva*, 547  
*prameya*, 248  
*Prameya-kamala-mārtaṇḍa*, 206  
*Prameya-mālā*, 349, 351 n.  
*Prameya-saṃgraha*, 128 n., 214 n., 216 n., 234  
*Prameya-sāra*, 110  
*Prameya-sekhara*, 135 n.  
*prameyatva*, 230 n.  
*prameyatvāt*, 230  
*Pranātārtihara*, 109  
*Pranātārtihara Pillan*, 110  
*Prapaṇna*, meanings of, 91  
*Prapaṇna-paritrāṇa*, 135 n.  
*Prapaṇna-pārijāta*, 352, 380  
*Prapaṇna-sāvitrī*, 137  
*Prapaṇnā-mṛta*, 63 n., 94, 97 n., 98, 100, 102 n., 105, 108, 109 n., 110 n., 138 n.  
*Prapaṇnāmṛta* relates, 97 n.  
*Prapañca-mithyātvā-bhaṅga*, 126  
*prapatti*, 54, 55, 68, 86, 89, 90, 91, 92, 96, 99, 101, 120, 122, 136, 137, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380; according to Saumyajāmāṭṛ Muni, 374 *et seq.*; its accessories, 92; its *angas*, 91 n.; its history, 379; its meaning, 90; its schools, 92 *et seq.*; its stages, 379  
*Prapatti-kārikā*, 125  
*Prapatti-naiṣṭhikam*, 86 n.  
*Prapatti-prayoga*, 380  
*prapāṭhaka*, 106  
*Prasaṅga-ratnākara*, 396 n.  
*prasāda*, 505  
*prasānti*, 505  
*Praśna*, 480  
*Praśnopamiṣat-prakāśikā*, 127  
*prasūti*, 502  
*pratibandha*, 538  
*pratibhā*, 537  
*pratiñā*, 427  
*Pratiñā-vāda*, 133  
*pratinidhi-nyāya*, 183  
*pratisaṅcara*, 497  
*Pratiṣṭhā-kāṇḍa*, 22  
*Prativādibhakeśari*, 117  
*Prativādhayaṅkara*, 112, 138  
*pratīter apahnavā eva syāt*, 238  
*pratyakṣa*, 220, 224, 426  
*Pratyāhāra*, 30, 61, 505  
*pravacana*, 514  
*pravartaka*, 61  
*pravāhā-nāditva*, 177 n.  
*Prayoga-ratna-mālā*, 116, 131  
*prayojana*, 420  
*Prābhākara* view, 248  
*prāga-bhāva*, 169, 177, 279, 328, 338, 353, 428  
*Prājāpatya-smṛti*, 20  
*prākāṣya*, 148  
*prākṛta*, 30  
*prākṛta-maṇḍala*, 415  
*prākṛta-pralaya*, 509  
*prākṛtā-tmā*, 483  
*prākṛtika*, 502, 503  
*prāmāṇika*, 313  
*prāmāṇya*, 202, 346, 347  
*prāṇa*, 7, 47, 49, 59, 80, 405, 540  
*prāṇa vāyu*, 59  
*prāṇāyāma*, 22, 23, 30, 32, 60, 61, 505, 506, 509 n.  
*Prāpti-dāśā*, 379  
*Prāpyā-nubhava-dāśā*, 379  
*prārabdha*, 445, 487, 488  
*prārabdha karma*, 378, 389, 414, 443, 487  
*prātikūlyasya varjanam*, 92  
*prāvaraṇa*, 515  
*prāyaścitta*, 92, 294; Veṅkaṭa's view, 294  
*Pre-Aryan*, 531  
*Pre-Buddhist Indian Philosophy*, 521 n.  
*Preceptor*, 28, 87, 89, 139, 156  
*Pre-condition*, 253  
*Predicate*, 80, 193, 271, 283, 438  
*Prediction*, 345  
*Pre-existent effect*, 265

- Preferences, 34  
 Prejudices, 317  
*prema-bhakti*, 401  
*Prema-sāra*, 102  
 Premises, 178  
 Prerogative grace, 85  
 Presence, 54  
 Present, 181, 284, 285, 446, 533  
 Presentation, 180, 182  
 Pride, 529  
 Priest, 104, 550  
 Primary, 41; cause, 179 n.; entities, 440; forms, 39; sense, 306  
 Primeval, 42 n.  
 Primordial, 44, 45, 447; elements, 128  
 Principle, 31, 32, 47, 57, 201, 502, 505, 507, 508, 512; of agreement, 226; of consciousness, 322, 463  
 Pringle Pattison, 451  
*priori*, 205  
 Priority, 419  
 Prior moment, 278  
*Priyāvar-tiru-mōri*, 138  
*priti*, 161  
*Pṛiti-kārita*, 136  
*priti-rūpo-paśāntatva-lakṣaṇam*, 382  
 Probability, 214  
 Probandum, 225, 228, 229, 231 n., 427, 534, 535  
*Proceedings and Transactions of the Third Oriental Conference*, 106 n.  
 Process, 30, 32, 42, 49, 50, 52, 54, 55, 56, 205, 292, 442, 453, 455, 458, 475, 495  
 Procession, 69  
 Product, 26, 29, 34, 36, 208, 331, 409, 423, 448, 449, 455, 477, 510, 548  
 Production, 184, 199, 204, 206, 265, 267, 268, 277, 278, 284, 292, 300, 328, 330, 331, 341, 342, 344, 411, 416, 428, 447, 454, 473, 481  
 Productive capacity, 354  
 Productivity, 465  
 Progress, 464, 514  
 Progressive, 37  
 Prohibited actions, 62  
 Proofs, 189, 406, 407, 457, 458  
 Proportion, 46, 54  
 Propositions, 190, 193, 201, 202, 223, 225, 227, 319  
 Protection, 54  
 Protector, 499, 507  
 Proximity, 316, 498  
 Prudence, 550  
*prthivī*, 49 n.  
 Psychical, 469; elements, 29  
 Psychological, 180, 185 n., 210, 237; state, 380 n.; transformations, 395  
 Psychologically, 180  
 Psychosis, 29, 30, 151, 412, 464  
 Publicity, 120  
 Pulaha, 21  
 Pulastya, 21  
*Puṁ-sakti*, 51  
 Punamali, 98  
 Punishment, 51, 92, 415  
 Puṇḍarikākṣa, 95, 96, 97, 98, 102 n., 109, 118  
 Puṇḍravardhana, 524 n.  
*puṇya*, 294  
 Pupil, 117, 127, 130, 131  
*pur*, 503  
 Purandara, 536, 539  
 Purāṇa, 16, 19, 20, 71, 72, 99, 105, 125, 445, 448, 471, 479, 486, 490, 497, 520, 550  
 Purāṇa Kassapa, 520, 522; his views, 520  
 Purāṇic, 452, 497, 549; legends, 80  
 Purāṇika, 122  
 Pure, 32, 34, 42, 44, 50, 311, 413, 420, 423, 430, 454, 467, 469, 470, 479, 490, 499, 500; action, 56; being, 10, 167, 175, 192, 193, 200, 291, 302, 311; bliss, 27, 344, 444, 494; brahman, 333, 432, 440; consciousness, 24, 26, 28, 29, 35, 51, 57, 143, 145, 166, 170, 171, 309, 311, 319, 320, 322, 323, 324, 325, 345, 362, 363, 367, 368, 369, 370, 372, 373, 374, 408, 409, 419, 421, 423, 445, 446, 448, 449, 450, 451, 453, 455, 457, 458, 460, 461, 462, 485, 492, 494; creation, 27; energy, 447; existence, 497; experience, 169; form, 438; illumination, 195, 407; impure-creation, 57; indeterminate, 344; intelligence, 26, 147, 148, 154; knowledge, 176, 408, 439, 441; nature, 302, 306, 338; revelation, 169; self, 408; soul, 453; space, 283  
 Purest qualities, 430  
 Purification, 60, 442  
 Purificatory rites, 22  
 Purity, 6, 29, 160, 406, 438, 441, 524  
 Purl, 94, 96, 103, 120  
*purovartī vastu*, 241  
 Purpose, 452, 474  
*Puruṣa*, 23, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 36, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 49, 52, 57, 147, 148, 259, 266, 296, 445, 446, 448, 449, 451, 453, 454, 455, 456, 459, 460, 461, 464, 466, 467, 468, 469,

*Puruṣa (cont.)*

470, 471, 473, 474, 475, 477, 479,  
480, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489,  
490, 491, 492, 493, 495, 497, 498,  
503, 504, 505, 507, 508, 509, 511,  
527; conception of in Vijñāna  
Bhikṣu, 448; consciousness of, 464

*puruṣakāra*, 378

*Puruṣa-ninṇaya*, 16, 96, 139, 352

*puruṣa-sūktā*, 12, 44, 105, 155

*puruṣārtha*, 136

*Puruṣārtha-ratnākara*, 132

*puruṣāvatāra*, 40 n.

"*puruṣo ha nārāyaṇaḥ*", 12

*Puruṣottama*, 38, 70, 116, 132, 403

*Puruṣottama prasāda*, 403

*Puruṣottamānya*, 112, 411

*puryām śete*, 504

*pūrṇa*, 36

*puṣṭi*, 57

*Pūṇadeva*, 402

*Pūrva-mīmāṃsā*, 350

*pūrva-pakṣa*, 519

*pūrvā-nubhūta-rajata-saṃskāra-dvārā*,  
246

*Pūṣā*, 58

*Pūtayogin*, 63

Qualifications, 28, 305, 308, 323

Qualified, 165, 193, 430; concept, 244;  
entity, 255, 279; monism, 430

Qualifying relation, 252

Qualitative, 550

Quality, 10, 25, 30, 34, 35, 36, 48, 53,  
54, 56, 61, 156, 181, 197, 207, 208,  
209, 212 n., 254, 255, 256, 284, 288,  
306, 311, 317, 324, 336, 340, 343,  
348, 351, 356, 357, 361, 411, 426,  
429, 430, 433, 435, 441, 442, 455,  
463, 465, 489, 493, 503, 505, 508,  
510, 548

Qualityless, 31, 306, 406, 407, 408,  
423, 430, 435, 499

Queen, 98

Question, 195

*Raghunāthācārya*, 133

*Raghunāthārya*, 117

*Raghūttama*, 137, 138

*Rahasya-mātrkā*, 124

*Rahasya-navanītam*, 123

*Rahasya-padavī*, 123

*Rahasya-rakṣā*, 90 n., 123, 380 n.

*Rahasya-ratnāvalī*, 126

*Rahasya-ratnāvalī-hṛdaya*, 124

*rahasyas*, 94

*Rahasya-sandēśa*, 124

*Rahasya-sandēśa-vivaraṇa*, 124

*Rahasya-śikhā-maṇi*, 124

*Rahasya-traya*, 110 n., 138

*Rahasya-traya-culuka*, 124, 125

*Rahasya-traya-jīvātū*, 131

*Rahasya-traya-kārikā*, 132

*Rahasya-traya-mīmāṃsā*, 117

*Rahasya-traya-mīmāṃsā-bhāṣya*, 126,  
131

*Rahasya-traya-sāra*, 18, 63 n., 124,  
125, 132

*Rahasya-traya-sāra-saṃgraha*, 133

*Rahasya-traya-sāra-tyākyā*, 132

*Rahasya-traya-sārārtha-saṃgraha*, 125

*rajas*, 25, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 129,

156, 163, 259, 447, 473, 474, 475,  
480, 481, 482, 501, 503, 504, 505, 507

*Rajendracola*, 96, 104

*rajoguna*, 448

*rakṣiṣyātīti vītvāsaḥ*, 92

*Rallying*, 79

*Ramya-jāmātr-mahā-muni*, 94 n., 98 n.

*Ramya-jāmātr-muni*, 89, 110, 111, 112,  
137; his works and relation to

*Rāmānuja*, 137, 138

*Raṅgadāsa*, 130

*Raṅganātha*, 69, 98, 121, 135

*Raṅganāthācārya*, 132

*Raṅgarāja*, 132, 138

*Raṅga Rāmānuja*, 115, 116, 127; his  
works, 126, 127

*Raṅga Rāmānuja Muni*, 126

*Raṅgācārya*, 110, 116, 130, 133, 382,  
384, 395, 396, 398 n.

*Raṅgeśa*, 102

*Rapturous*, 73, 79; passions, 83

*rasa*, 49 n., 226, 510, 511

*Rasa-bhaumāmṛta*, 122

*rasa-mātra*, 510

*rasa-tan-mātra*, 163, 260, 261, 499

*rati*, 57

*Rational*, 177 n.

*Ratna-prabhā*, 107 n.

*Ratna-sārīṇi*, 114, 116, 132, 352

*Raurava* hell, 20

*Ravishing* joy, 83

*Ravishing* love, 79

*Ravishment* of soul, 79

*Ray* of lamp, 384

*Rays*, 182, 444

*Rādhā*, 81, 82, 401

*Rādhā-kṛṣṇaśaraṇadeva*, 402

*rāga*, 10, 470

*rāga-prāpta-prapatti*, 377

*Rāghavācārya*, 94, 133

*Rāhoḥ śiraḥ*, 4

*Rāhu*, 4, 239

- Rāhujit, 40 n.  
 Rājagopāla, 95  
 Rājārāja, 523  
*rājasa*, 31, 163, 498  
*rājasa ahaṃkāra*, 31, 259, 504 n.  
*Rājasa-sāstra*, 21, 22  
 Rākṣasa, 532  
 Rāma, 38, 39, 40 n., 82, 429  
 Rāmacandra Bhaṭṭa, 401  
 Rāmadesika, 102 n.  
 Rāmakṛṣṇa, 204  
 Rāma Miśra, 95, 97, 98, 114, 125, 181 n., 395 n.  
 Rāma-miśra-desika, 114  
 Rāmanātha Yogī, 133  
*Rāma-rahasya Upaniṣad*, 13  
 Rāma Subrahmanyasaśtri, 132  
*Rāmatāpint Upaniṣad*, 13  
 Rāmatīrtha, 106, 107, 197 n.  
 Rāmānuja, 1 n., 3, 24, 64, 66, 67, 80, 85, 86, 88 n., 89, 94, 99, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115 n., 116, 117, 119, 123, 125, 130, 132, 133, 134, 137, 138, 139, 155, 156, 157, 159, 161, 165, 168, 171, 172, 173, 176, 177, 179, 180, 181, 182, 185 n., 186 n., 187, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 198, 200, 201, 203, 204, 206, 210, 214, 218, 219, 220, 225, 226, 227, 229 n., 233, 237, 239, 240, 251, 261, 264, 274, 277, 281, 285, 295, 290, 297, 298, 305, 313, 315, 317, 321, 348, 352, 354, 379, 380, 381, 385, 386, 387, 388, 395, 396, 399, 400, 404, 429, 430, 451, 472, 496, 497; *avidyā* of Śaṅkara refuted, 175 *et seq.*; criticism of Śaṅkara's ontological views, 196; his conception of individual volitions, 298-9; his controversy with Śaṅkara on the nature of reality, 165 *et seq.*; his criticism of *māyā*, 197; his criticism of Prakāśātman, 197; his criticism of theistic proofs, 189 *et seq.*; his life, 100 *et seq.*; his ontological views, 195 *et seq.*; his principal disciples, 109 *et seq.*; his refutation of Śaṅkara's theory of illusion, 179; his *sutkārya-vāda*, 199-200; his theory of illusion, 179 *et seq.*; his view criticized from the Nimbārka point of view, 429 *et seq.*; his view of God, 155 *et seq.*; his view of God in relation to self, 159 *et seq.*; his view that all knowledge is real, 179 *et seq.*; his view of perception contrasted with that of Meghanāḍari, 218; his views of *pramāṇa* contrasted with those of Śaṅkara and Nyāya, 204; his view of relation of cause and effect, 198-9; his views contrasted with those of Bhāskara, 192 *et seq.*; literature of the school, 114; logic, 226, 229; philosophy, 346; principal episodes of his life, 113; theory, 346; view, 270; view of self-validity of knowledge, 247 *et seq.*  
*Rāmānuja, Life of*, 97 n., 105 n.  
 Rāmānuja school, 202, 209, 281, 317, 318, 340, 346, 352, 364; refutation by the Śaṅkarites, 113  
*Rāmānuja-bhāṣya*, 157, 180, 298, 380 n.  
*Rāmānuja-carita-culuka*, 117, 126  
 Rāmānujadāsa, 98, 110, 117, 123, 125, 305, 361; his works, 125, 126  
 Rāmānujadāsa (Mahācārya), his refutation of *añāna* being Bhāvarūpa, 361 *et seq.*  
 Rāmānujadāśabhikṣu, 132  
 Rāmānujaguru, 138  
*Rāmānuja-muṇḍāḍī*, 66 n., 137  
*Rāmānuja-nava-ratna-mālikā*, 133  
*Rāmānuja-siddhānta-saṃgraha*, 129, 204 n., 224 n., 226, 227, 297  
*Rāmānuja-siddhānta-śara*, 117, 126  
 Rāmānujācārya, 111, 117, 131, 183, 250, 251, 354, 355, 356, 358; his refutation of the objections against self-validity, 250 n., 251  
 Rāmānujācārya II, 352, 361  
 Rāmānujārya, 137  
*Rāmānujārya-divya-charitai*, 103, 104, 105  
 Rāmānujists, 86, 239, 265, 291, 301, 322, 325, 327, 388, 435  
 Rāmāyaṇa, 82, 379, 396 n., 530; reference to heretics in, 530  
 Rāmāyaṇa, 529  
*Rāmottarottara-tāpint Upaniṣad*, 13  
*rāsīs*, 39  
 Rāu, Mr T. A. Gopī-nātha, 65, 66, 68, 96, 103, 104; Lectures, 103  
 Rāvāna, 82  
 Real, 4, 166, 179, 181, 182, 183, 193, 194, 195, 196, 208, 306, 309, 313, 314, 315, 316, 325, 330, 332, 333, 337, 338, 339, 343, 353, 364, 373, 388, 417, 419, 423, 435, 437, 441, 454, 457, 486, 495; agent, 411; basis, 182, 210; fact, 365; knower, 411; knowledge, 237, 371; nature, 337; object, 181, 240; silver, 244; world, 350  
 Realism, 184, 210

- Reality, 10, 16, 27, 28, 34, 42, 60, 173,  
 179, 194, 198, 201, 210, 211, 300,  
 310, 313, 322, 325, 326, 332, 386,  
 417, 435, 445, 449, 454, 455, 456,  
 457, 458, 460, 465, 472, 476, 482,  
 483, 487, 525 n., 526, 529, 550; as  
 qualified or unqualified—Sāṅkara  
 and Rāmānuja's controversy on,  
 115 *et seq.*  
 Realization, 70, 106, 295, 304, 306, 308,  
 310, 311, 339, 382, 383, 414, 415, 437,  
 441, 442, 443, 464, 485, 492, 502  
 Reason, 53, 178, 189, 212, 231 n., 264,  
 326, 427, 438, 533, 534, 535  
 Reasoning, 255, 437; in a circle, 409  
 Rebirths, 7, 28, 51, 299, 329, 370, 382,  
 407, 441, 483, 517, 525, 548, 550  
 Receptacle, 333  
 Reception, 359  
 Receptive, 48  
 Recluse, 520, 521  
 Recognition, 128, 142, 143, 221, 269,  
 437  
 Recollection, 79, 290  
 Red goddess, 37  
 Reference, 30, 344, 351, 447, 454, 489,  
 519, 523  
 Reflections, 29, 31, 147, 211, 411, 421,  
 422, 440, 448, 453, 460, 464, 467,  
 485, 490, 528  
 Refutation of the Buddhist view of  
 soul, 142  
 Refutation of the Sāṅkara view of  
 soul, 142 *et seq.*  
 Refutations, 133, 177 n., 252, 305, 422,  
 424  
 Regression, 330  
 Relata, 218, 315, 424  
 Relation, 50, 53, 54, 193, 206, 218, 299,  
 301, 314, 315, 316, 335, 416, 423,  
 424, 426, 444, 448, 451, 455, 456,  
 459, 460, 462, 471, 500, 539, 542; of  
 contact, 129; of inherence, 55  
 Relationless, 11  
 Relative existence, 198  
 Relative pluralism, 302  
 Relative positions, 349  
 Relatively real, 197  
 Relativistic, 210  
 Release, 514  
 Religion, 81, 86, 303, 471, 531, 533  
 Religious, 120, 501, 549; duties, 91;  
 faith, 86; festivities, 23; marks, 19;  
 performances, 38; practices, 19;  
 stages, 2; value, 305  
 Reminiscence, 79, 105  
 Remoteness, 316  
 Representation, 180, 480  
 Repression, 62  
 Reproduction, 245  
 Researches, 64  
 Resolve, 54  
 Respiration, 59  
 Responsibility, 472  
 Restraint, 550  
 Resultant, 37  
 Results, 294, 442  
 Retention, 60  
 Revelation, 171, 215, 250 n., 270, 307,  
 309, 323, 326, 347, 411, 412, 449; of  
 knowledge, 169  
 Reverence, 404  
 Reward, 51, 415  
 Rhetorical school, 82; their analysis of  
 art communication as influenced in  
 the Gaudīya Vaiṣṇavas, 82  
 Rhys Davids, 512, 513, 514 n., 515 n.  
 Rice, Mr, 104 n.  
 Right actions, 327  
 Right apprehension, 183  
 Right conditions, 246  
 Right feelings, 327  
 Right knowledge, 5, 203, 204, 245, 300,  
 326, 327, 411, 423  
 Rites, 16, 19, 39 n., 103  
 Ritual, 2, 18, 19, 22, 23, 70; cere-  
 monies, 17  
 Ritualistic, 8, 16, 24, 120, 132; dif-  
 ferences, 381; worship, 22, 23  
 Rival sects, 120  
 Rohiṇī, 229, 279  
 Root, 34, 46, 59  
 Root-*ajñāna*, 369  
 Root-cause, 187, 244  
 Root-elements, 45  
 Root-ignorance, 369  
 Root-impressions, 43, 44, 54, 258, 281,  
 287, 308, 372  
 Root-instincts, 29, 30, 33, 34, 51, 469  
 Rudra, 16, 475, 507  
 Rules, 128  
 Russel, 539 n.  
 Rūpa, 40 n., 49 n., 510, 511  
 Rūpa Gosvāmī, 82  
*rūpa-mātra*, 510  
*rūpa-tan-mātra*, 163, 260, 261, 499  
*Rg-veda*, 12  
*rju-vivaraṇa*, 106  
 Ṛṣi Nārāyaṇa, 482  
*Ṛṣi-rātra*, 23  
*ṛṣis*, 21  
  
*sabbe bhūtā*, 524  
*sabbe pāṇā*, 524

- sabbe sattā*, 524  
*Sac-caritra-rakṣā*, 122  
 Sacrifice, 23, 29, 55, 293, 350, 384,  
 450, 519, 520, 530; of Nārāyaṇa, in  
*Śata-paṭha*, 12  
*Sad-artha-saṃkṣepa*, 128 n.  
*sad-asad-anirvacanīyā*, 165  
*sad-asad-ātmaka*, 497  
*sad-asadrūpa*, 456  
*sad-asad-vilakṣaṇa*, 177  
*sad-asad-vyatiṛekah*, 239 n.  
*Saddā-cārabodha*, 133  
*Sadda-ntti*, 513  
*Sad-vidyā-vijaya*, 126, 361, 365 n.,  
 366 n., 370 n., 372 n.  
*śad-darśana-samuccaya*, 516 n., 533  
 Sages, 13, 21, 25, 45, 220, 474, 483  
*Sahasra-giti*, 102 n., 104, 109 n., 134  
*Sahasra-giti-bhāṣya*, 113 n.  
*Sahasra-giti-vyākhyā*, 110  
*Sahasra-kiraṇī*, 123  
*sahetuka*, 85  
*sahopalambha*, 146  
 Saint, 13, 40, 71, 189  
 Sainthood, 414, 441  
 Saintliness, 448  
*śaṭītya-guṇavattvam*, 257  
*sakala*, 30, 31  
*sal-lakṣaṇa*, 10  
*sallāpa*, 513  
*sallāpa-kathā*, 513  
 Salvation, 24, 32, 44, 55, 56, 78, 89,  
 129, 292, 307, 421, 432, 444, 463,  
 473  
*Samara-puṇḡavācārya*, 127 n.  
*samavāya*, 219, 222, 256, 301, 455,  
 456; relation, 256  
*samavāya-samavāyi-bhinna*, 388  
*samavāyi*, 456  
*samādhi*, 22, 29, 33, 60, 61  
*samāna*, 59, 60  
*samāna-dharma*, 211, 212, 213  
*samārādhana*, 10  
*Samāsa-vāda*, 133  
*sambandha-jñānitvam*, 87 n.  
*sambhava*, 426, 428  
 Sameness, 142; of quality, 161  
*sampradāya*, 400  
*Sampradāya-parisuddhi*, 123  
*samuccaya*, 8  
*saṃghāta*, 252, 262  
*Samgita-mālā*, 128 n.  
*Samgraha*, 119  
*Samhitā*, 21, 24, 39  
*saṃkalpa*, 34, 36, 45, 191, 504  
*saṃkalpa-sūryodaya*, 120, 121, 122  
*saṃkalpamayī mūrti*, 42  
*Samkarṣaṇa*, 13, 21, 22, 34, 37, 39, 52,  
 56, 57, 157, 158, 443 n., 475  
*Samkṣepa-śāstraka*, 106, 107, 197 n.  
*saṃsarga*, 187  
*saṃsarga-vyāpāra*, 185  
*saṃsāra*, 43 n., 477  
*Samśāra-sāmrājyam*, 135 n.  
*saṃskāra*, 8, 63 n., 98, 209, 223, 372,  
 423  
*saṃsthāna*, 356  
*saṃśaya-dvaya-samāhāra*, 213  
 Saṃvat 1112, 399  
 Saṃvat 1806, 399  
*saṃvin-nānātva-samarthana*, 133  
*saṃvit*, 168, 170, 503, 504, 510  
*saṃvṛtā-tman*, 501  
*saṃyoga*, 225  
*saṃyuktāśraya*, 225  
*Samyutta*, 524  
 Sana, 21  
 Sanaka, 21, 40 n., 400, 482  
 Sanandana, 21, 482  
 Sanatkumāra, 21, 482, 502  
 Sanatsujāti, 21  
 Sanātana, 21  
 Sandal, 221; paste, 7  
*Sandhyā-vandana-bhāṣya*, 118, 130  
*San-mārga-dīpa*, 395 n., 398 n.  
*san-mātra*, 200  
*san-mātra-grāhī*, 167  
*sannyāsin*, 102, 137  
 Sanskrit, 1 n., 9, 64, 107, 123, 125, 134,  
 135, 137, 138; literature, 3 n.; texts,  
 132  
*Sanskrit Manuscripts*, 401 n.  
 Sanskritic, 383 n.  
*santoṣa*, 61, 62 n.  
 Saṅgati-mālā, 119, 234, 383 n.  
*Saṅgati-sāra*, 133  
*saṅketa*, 544  
*saṅkucita-svarūpam*, 172  
*sañcīta*, 443  
*saṅkocavikāśārham*, 172  
*sa-pakṣa*, 230, 231  
*saprakāśatva*, 358  
*Sapta-gāthā*, 138  
*Saptati-ratna-mālikā*, 133  
 Sarasvatī, 52, 57, 59, 399  
*sarga*, 502  
*sarga-pratisarga*, 496  
 Saroyogin, 63  
*sarvabhṛt*, 61  
*Sarva-darśana-saṃgraha*, 120, 400,  
 515, 516, 532, 533, 534 n.  
*Sarva-darśana-śiromaṇi*, 118, 132  
*sarva-dharma-vahiṣkṛta*, 20  
*sarva-ga*, 61

- Sarvajñātma muni, 106, 107, 197  
*sarva-svabhāva-viraha*, 271  
*sarva-vittva*, 231  
*sarvā-ntara*, 483  
*Sarvārtha-siddhi*, 122, 128 n., 209, 251 n., 252 n., 255 n., 256 n., 257 n., 264 n., 265 n., 266 n., 267 n., 268 n., 269 n., 270 n., 272 n., 274 n., 276 n., 277 n., 278 n., 279 n., 281 n., 282 n., 283 n., 286 n., 288 n., 289 n., 290 n., 291 n., 292 n., 293 n., 294 n., 295 n., 296 n., 302 n., 346, 352, 353 n., 354 n., 355 n.  
*sat*, 154, 444, 457  
*satatam kurvato jagat*, 36  
 Satisfaction, 92  
*sat-kārya-vāda*, 43, 200, 265, 267; other views contrasted with those of Rāmānuja, 200  
*sat-kārya-vādin*, 200  
*sat-khyāti*, 128, 183, 184, 410  
*sattā*, 243  
*sattākhyā*, 29  
*sattākhyā-jñāna*, 29  
*sattha*, 513, 514  
*sattva*, 25, 30, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 57, 128, 129, 156, 163, 259, 446, 447, 470, 471, 473, 475, 479, 480, 481, 482, 488, 491, 504, 505, 507; part, 473; quality, 454; body, 472, 481  
*sattva-guṇa*, 45, 448  
*sattvamaya*, 448, 451  
*sattva-stuff*, 472  
*sattvo-pādhi*, 481  
*sattvā*, 358, 513  
*Satya*, 27, 29, 61, 351  
*satyam*, 503  
*satyaṃ jñānam anantam brahma*, 165  
 Saugandhakulya, 97  
 Saumya Jāmātṛ muni, 24, 110, 111, 115, 120, 131 n., 132, 134, 135, 137, 138, 374, 380, 381; his conception of Lakṣmī, 375; his conception of *prapatti*, *bhakti* and *prema*, 377; his doctrine of *prapatti*, 376 *et seq.*  
*Saura-kāṇḍa*, 22  
*Sauri-rāja-caraṇāra-vinda-śaraṇāgati-sāra*, 132  
*sausādṛya*, 297, 355  
*sa-vigraha*, 31  
*sa-vikalpa*, 217, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 311, 544; knowledge, 219  
*sa-vikalpa-pratyakṣa*, 166  
 Saviour, 86 n.  
*sādhana*, 62  
*sādhana*, 487  
*sādhya*, 62, 228, 230, 231, 427, 535, 536, 537, 538  
*sādrīya*, 355, 427; Vādihaṃsa's conception of it as *saṁsthāna*, 356; Venkaṭa's conception of it, 355  
*sākṣād-avatāra*, 38, 39  
*sākṣātkara*, 62, 485  
*sākṣātkāri-pramā*, 216  
*sākṣāt-fakti*, 41, 42 n., 57  
*sākṣāttva*, 217  
*sākṣi-consciousness*, 325, 326, 337, 363, 367  
*sākṣin*, 325, 326  
*sākṣi*, 144, 173, 483  
*sālokya*, 443 n.  
*sālokya-mukti*, 50  
*sāmagrī*, 204, 220  
*sāmānya-gocaram*, 534  
*sāmpṛya*, 443 n.  
*sāmpṛa dāyika*, 181 n.  
*Sāṃkhya*, 18, 23, 30, 43, 52, 62, 144, 148, 156, 200, 256, 258, 259, 261, 265, 266, 296, 440, 445, 449, 459, 461, 462, 464, 471, 472, 473, 476, 479, 480, 481, 482, 485, 496, 498, 512, 521, 527; categories, 25; doctrine, 479, 480; inference, 256; in relation to Vedānta according to Vijñāna Bhikṣu, 471 *et seq.*; mode, 157; philosophy, 501 n.; theory, 265; theory of *sat-kārya-vāda*, refutation by Venkaṭa, 365 *et seq.*; view, 281 n.  
*Sāṃkhya-kārikā*, 448, 501 n.  
*Sāṃkhya-Pātañjala*, 45  
*Sāṃkhya-pravacana-bhāṣya*, 482  
*Sāṃkhya-sāra*, 482  
*Sāṃkhya-sūtra*, 448, 473  
*Sāṃkhya-yoga*, 466, 539; Vijñāna Bhikṣu's criticism of, 479 *et seq.*  
*Sāṃkhyist*, 46, 147, 163, 256, 257, 259, 261, 265, 266, 343, 386, 462, 476, 527  
*Sāra-darpaṇa*, 115, 384, 389 n., 392  
*Sāra-dīpa*, 124  
*Sāra-niṣkaṣa-ṭṭppant*, 127  
*Sāra-saṃgraha*, 124, 135 n.  
*Sāra-sāra*, 124  
*Sārattha-pakāśint*, 514, 515 n.  
*Sāra-rtha-catuṣṭaya*, 352  
*Sāra-rtha-saṃgraha*, 110 n.  
*sārūpya*, 442 n.  
*sāttvika*, 31, 163, 498  
*sāttvika ahaṃkāra*, 259, 504  
*Sāttvika purāṇas*, 20  
*sātvata*, 12, 15, 17, 19, 22

- Sātvata-saṃhitā*, 12 n., 21, 40 n., 42 n., 57  
*sātvata-śāna*, 62  
*Sātvika-śāstra*, 21  
 Sāvathī, 522  
*sāyujya*, 161, 443 n.  
*sāyujya-mukti*, 474  
 Scepticism, 244, 520  
 Sceptics, 520  
 Scholars, 86, 104  
 Scholarship, 94  
 Scholastic, 133, 373; criticism, 364  
 School, 111; of logic, 112  
 Schrader, 37, 38, 40 n., 41, 42 n., 50  
 Science, 34, 512, 514, 516, 518  
 Scientific, 181  
 Scope, 328, 422  
 Scriptural, 33, 180, 223; criticism, 388; duties, 61, 89, 90, 91, 92, 100, 293, 307; injunctions, 303; interpretation, 326; knowledge, 307, 326; testimony, 136, 211, 214, 296, 306, 326, 327, 352, 406, 426, 468; texts, 5, 15, 16, 17, 181, 192, 199, 208, 280, 302, 329, 338, 340, 383, 385, 387, 388, 392, 396, 397, 407, 426, 429, 431, 438, 448, 458, 465, 468, 486, 490, 508, 517; view, 549  
 Scriptures, 4, 7, 8, 9, 25, 50, 52, 54, 146, 166, 168, 174, 189, 203, 216, 256, 259, 281, 289, 294, 296, 302, 303, 306, 319, 326, 340, 350, 361, 371, 380 n., 406, 407, 428, 437, 442, 452, 465, 472, 494, 539  
 Sea, 6, 487  
 Secondary, 38, 41; sense, 306  
 Sectarian, 305; authors, 18; difference, 381; quarrels, 120  
 Section, 305  
 Sect of Brahmins, 2  
 Sects, 512 n.  
 Seed, 184, 330, 429, 509  
 Self, 12, 26, 129, 140, 143, 146, 148, 149, 150, 151, 172, 208, 287, 288, 289, 290, 292, 306, 308, 315, 323, 324, 327, 330, 345, 346, 361, 365, 369, 408, 409, 411, 412, 426, 428, 439, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 453, 459, 463, 464, 469, 470, 483, 485, 486, 487, 494, 495, 509, 523 n., 528, 529, 547, 548, 549; how its knowledge rises according to Rāmānuja, 159; in relation to God according to Rāmānuja, 159 *et seq.*; Nimbārka's conception of, 411 *et seq.*; Veṅkṭa's view of self in relation to God, 161 *et seq.*; according to Yāmuna, its nature, 140 *et seq.*; and the problem of consciousness, 149 *et seq.*; refutation of Kumārila's view, 148; refutation of the Sāṃkhya view, 147  
 Self-abnegation, 55, 60, 62, 414  
 Self-apperception, 93  
 Self-conscious, 27, 412; entities, 159  
 Self-consciousness, 9, 140, 146, 151, 154, 155, 173, 216, 274, 315, 324, 369, 466, 546, 547  
 Self-contradiction, 90, 239, 269  
 Self-contradictory, 193, 202, 230, 231, 239, 256, 266, 272, 334, 342, 398, 469, 486, 512  
 Self-control, 22, 33, 160  
 Self-criticism, 32  
 Self-dependent, 36  
 Self-destruction, 324  
 Self-discriminative, 382  
 Self-dynamism, 433  
 Self-ejected idea, 244  
 Self-evident, 315  
 Self-existent, 297  
 Self-fulfilment, 382  
 Self-identification, 475  
 Self-identity, 269  
 Self-illuminating, 35, 358  
 Self-illumination, 176, 358  
 Self-introspection, 141  
 Self-invalidity, 249  
 Self-knowledge, 290, 383, 384, 466, 467, 468, 487  
 Self-love, 443, 470  
 Self-luminosity, 317, 325, 345, 358, 359, 367, 407, 438, 468; its treatment by Vijñāna Bhikṣu, 468 *et seq.*  
 Self-luminous, 61, 171, 176, 178, 243, 290, 310, 315, 316, 319, 325, 340, 347, 360, 361, 370, 407, 408, 438, 439, 466, 468  
 Self-luminousness, 439  
 Self-manifestation, 214, 248  
 Self-manifesting, 142, 149, 150  
 Self-mastery, 520  
 Self-offering, 60, 62  
 Self-perceiving, 413  
 Self-realized, 24  
 Self-realization, 28, 29, 302, 382, 383, 487  
 Self-revealed, 315  
 Self-revealing, 160, 166, 168, 171, 230, 240, 249, 306, 315, 358  
 Self-revelation, 170, 306, 318  
 Self-shining, 332

- Self-sufficiency, 35  
 Self-surrender, 86, 87, 89, 112, 120, 136, 379  
 Self-surrendering, 78; association, 91  
 Self-valid, 9, 247, 250, 348, 357  
 Self-validity, 240, 249, 250 n., 251, 289, 347, 348, 356, 357, 428; of cognition, 240; of knowledge, Bhaṭṭa and Prabhākara view, 249  
 Selves, 44, 345, 346, 411, 451, 465, 476, 477; as inseparable from God, 298-300  
 Semi-conscious, 83  
 Senai Nathan, 67 n.  
 Senānātha, 117  
 Senḍa, 66  
 Seniors, 185 n., 186 n.  
 Sensations, 253, 386  
 Sense, 7, 8, 9, 27, 30, 32, 33, 43, 47, 48, 49, 80, 181, 182, 189, 196, 280, 281 n., 289, 300, 306, 311, 317, 325, 414, 427, 435, 462, 466, 502, 505, 540, 543, 545, 547  
 Sense-appearances, 290  
 Sense-character, 254, 284, 285  
 Sense-cognitions, 289, 547  
 Sense-consciousness, 450  
 Sense-contact, 189, 203, 204, 206, 270, 280, 311  
 Sense-data, 251, 291, 544  
 Sense-faculty, 280, 463  
 Sense-function, 281, 539  
 Sense-gratifications, 531  
 Sense-impressions, 223  
 Sense-inclinations, 22  
 Sense-knowledge, 206, 217, 544  
 Sense-objects, 32, 152, 411, 449, 546, 550  
 Sense-organ, 8, 9, 13, 28, 172, 179, 184, 185 n., 189, 204, 205, 206, 222, 223, 270, 280, 290, 295, 347, 411, 533, 534, 540, 543, 544, 546  
 Sense-perception, 31, 151, 217, 223, 503  
 Sense-pleasures, 550  
 Sense-qualities, 251, 252, 253  
 Sense of possession, 71  
 Sensible, 288, 290; qualities, 27, 31  
 Sensory, 467  
 Sensual joys, 550  
 Sensuous, 325  
 Sentient, 54  
 Separate *aśānas*, 369  
 Separate wholes, 263, 264  
 Separateness, 264  
 Separation, 71, 72, 327  
 Sequence, 184, 273  
 Series, 310, 353, 540, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547  
 Servants, 83, 84, 87; of God, 89  
 Service, 54, 88  
 Servitude, 136, 161, 377; of God, 89  
*Seṣvara-mīmāṃsā*, 18 n, 124  
 Sevadeva, 402  
 Sex-emotions, 549  
 Sex-indulgence, 549  
 Shapes, 5  
 Shining, 336; character, 232, 243, 244; entity, 242  
 Shop, 181  
*siddha-prema*, 378  
*siddha-vastu-virodhi*, 354 n.  
*Siddhānta-cintāmaṇi*, 115, 116, 388, 389 n., 390 n., 391 n., 392  
*Siddhānta-jāhnavī*, 404  
*Siddhānta-nirnaya*, 122  
*Siddhānta-ratna*, 403  
*Siddhānta-ratnāvalī*, 12, 18, 132  
*Siddhānta-saṃgraha*, 130, 203 n.  
*Siddhānta-setukā*, 404  
*Siddhānta-siddhānta-jāna*, 133  
*Siddhānta-śiromaṇi*, 3  
*Siddhānta-śravaṇa*, 61  
*Siddhānta-vaijayanī*, 18  
*Siddhi-traya*, 98, 105, 108, 109, 128 n., 154, 155, 229 n.  
*Siddhy-upāya-sudarśana*, 127  
 Significance, 53, 293, 297  
 Silver, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 241, 242, 244, 245, 310, 336, 337, 346, 408; elements, 241; image, 245  
 Similar, 298  
 Similarity, 142, 179, 182, 183, 234, 297, 298, 351, 355, 423, 426, 427, 428  
 Simplicity, 180, 186 n.  
 Simultaneity, 142, 254  
 Simultaneous, 276; perception, 281  
*siṃha*, 60  
 Sin, 34, 295, 303, 388, 441, 446, 505, 524, 526, 528, 550  
 Sincerity, 158  
 Sinful, 294, 304, 549  
 Sinner, 99  
 Sirup-pullur-udaya-Pillai, 97 n.  
 Situation, 332, 434, 455  
 Six qualities, 37  
*Śitā-upaniṣad*, 41, 42 n., 57  
*skanda*, 402  
*Skanda-purāṇa*, 19 n., 507 n.  
 Skill, 194  
 Sky, 128, 447  
 Sleep, 169, 240, 257

- smaraṇa*, 505  
*smaraṇam*, 178 n.  
 Smell, 251  
 Smell-potential, 163, 510  
 Smoke, 211, 226 n., 534, 536, 538  
*smṛti*, 14, 15, 16, 20, 57, 125, 471, 503,  
 504, 510, 517, 549; literature, 19  
*Sneha-pūrti*, 395 n.  
 Social, 472, 549  
 Sophistry, 514, 515, 516, 517  
 Sophists, 518  
 Sorrow, 52, 441, 443 n., 444, 445, 463,  
 464, 470, 486, 491, 506, 508  
 Sorrowful, 46  
 Sottanambi, 109 n.  
 Souls, 6, 7, 10, 35, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62,  
 80, 83, 125, 139, 140, 147, 151, 154,  
 155, 157, 177 n., 189, 194, 200, 286,  
 291, 295, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302,  
 381, 385, 393, 395, 412, 413, 422,  
 430, 431, 434, 435, 441, 443, 444,  
 451, 453, 457, 458, 483, 485, 489,  
 503, 517, 519, 525, 526, 527, 530,  
 531, 539, 543, 546, 547, 549, 550  
 Sound, 5, 33, 48, 58, 167  
 Sound-potential, 504, 510  
 Source, 292, 295, 303, 348, 494, 521,  
 530; of knowledge, 185 n., 465  
 South, 18  
 South India, 19, 80, 138, 523  
 South Indian, 81 n.  
 Southern India, 63  
 Space, 6, 27, 34, 48, 82, 163, 195, 199,  
 228, 252, 264, 273, 277, 282, 301,  
 521; relations, 284  
 Spaceless, 72  
 Sparks, 6  
*sparsā*, 49 n., 261, 510, 511  
*sparsā-tan-mātra*, 163, 260, 261, 499,  
 510  
 Spatial, 313, 324, 343, 353; character,  
 353; contiguity, 316; difference,  
 245; qualification, 238; quality, 245;  
 units, 264  
 Spatial-temporal, 489  
 Spatio-temporal, 226  
 Special, 43, 208; powers, 38; quality,  
 393  
 Species, 173  
 Specific cause, 279  
 Specific characters, 46 n.  
 Specific effect, 279  
 Specific modes, 364  
 Specific nature, 356  
 Specific qualities, 263  
 Spectator, 82  
 Speculations, 496  
 Speech, 3, 4, 34, 48, 53, 168  
*spṛṣṭa*, 107 n., 108 n.  
 Spider, 59, 406  
 Spirit, 32, 55, 298, 299, 302, 350, 406,  
 460, 472, 492; part, 301, 302; of  
 service, 70  
 Spiritual, 10, 28, 35, 41, 44, 47, 48, 60,  
 373, 385, 386; emancipation, 378;  
 energy, 51; entities, 36; fact, 377;  
 form, 37, 38; love, 81; nature, 406;  
 transformation, 10; zeal, 72  
 Spirituality, 472  
 Spontaneity, 56, 85, 442  
 Spontaneous, 27, 34, 35, 36, 85, 214,  
 215, 292, 452; agency, 37; grace, 88;  
 production, 277  
 Sportive, 444  
*Sṛṣṭi-khaṇḍa*, 532  
 Staffs, 532  
 Stage, 44, 46 n., 47, 48, 50, 56, 58, 60,  
 79, 292, 311, 422, 458, 486, 491, 503,  
 541, 544; of life, 11, 416; of love,  
 82  
 Stars, 515 n.  
 State, 35, 41, 50, 52, 56, 290, 295, 339,  
 344, 414, 438, 439, 441, 443, 444,  
 445, 446, 457, 458, 469, 471, 476,  
 486, 488, 494, 495, 503, 545, 546  
 Static, 29, 446, 492; entities, 36  
 Statical, 46  
 Status, 437  
 Stick, 1 n., 2, 342, 549  
 Stone, 41  
*Stotra-ratnam*, 98, 99, 101  
*Stotra-ratnākara*, 123  
*Stotra-trayī*, 403  
 Strength, 35, 404  
 Structural Brahman, 434  
 Structural cause, 47  
 Structure, 500  
 Study of the Vedas, 29  
 Sub-commentary, 137, 138  
 Sub-conscious image, 237; impres-  
 sions, 228, 268  
 Sub-consciousness, 8, 222, 227, 258,  
 270, 281, 437  
*Subhāṣita-nīti*, 121  
 Subject, 178, 193, 194, 204, 280, 283,  
 297 n., 368  
 Subjective, 170, 179, 238, 268,  
 490  
 Subjectivity, 325  
 Submission, 54  
*Subodhint*, 116, 132  
 Subserviency, 299  
 Subsidiary, 27, 39, 58, 90  
 Subsistence, 256

- Substance, 10, 34, 35, 80, 129, 147, 183, 193, 195, 199, 208, 209, 211, 212, 222, 224, 245, 251, 252, 253, 254, 256, 258, 288, 299, 303, 334, 343, 344, 361, 425, 430, 431, 455, 463, 464, 493, 500  
 Substantiality, 431  
 Substantive, 385  
 Substitution, 210  
 Substratum, 142, 188, 238, 408, 456, 475, 484  
 Subtle, 35, 42, 45, 58, 61, 298, 415, 445, 475, 504; aspects, 194; body, 24; cause, 476; constituents, 299; essence, 80; form, 29, 301; matter, 414; state, 396, 397  
 Succession, 142, 207, 310, 353  
 Sudarśana, 34, 35, 41, 51, 53, 57, 126, 130, 132, 401, 448 n.  
 Sudarśana Bhaṭṭa, 111  
 Sudarśanaguru, 126, 130  
*Sudarśana-saṃhitā*, 23  
*Sudarśana-sura-druma*, 133  
 Sudarśana Sūri, 109 n., 113, 114, 115, 118, 120, 130, 135, 176 n., 177 n., 181 n., 182, 186 n.; his refutation of *ajñāna*, 177 n.; his works, 130  
*Sudarśana śakti*, 50  
 Sudarśanācārya, 118, 126, 298; his view of relation of souls to God, 297  
 Suffering, 52, 291, 292, 303, 304, 412, 464, 521, 524  
 Suffix, 166, 233  
 Suggestion, 343, 344  
*sukha*, 463, 464, 485  
*Sumaṅgala-vilāsinī*, 513 n., 520, 521 n., 522 n., 524 n.  
 Sumerian, 531; civilization, 529  
*summum bonum*, 136, 379, 420  
 Sun, 6, 42, 59, 153, 228, 295, 349, 447  
 Sundara Bhaṭṭa, 404  
 Sundaradeśika, 112  
 Sundararāja-deśika, 117, 130  
 Super-consciousness, 450, 490  
 Superintendence, 31, 152, 189  
 Superintendent, 56, 58, 104  
 Superintending, 38  
 Superior, 53, 54; devotees, 380  
 Superiority, 53  
 Supplementary, 123  
 Support, 34, 56, 300, 330, 333, 334, 338, 350, 422, 477  
 Supposition, 322, 330, 332, 406, 408, 410, 423, 439  
 Supra-sensible, 550  
 Supreme, 28, 33, 42, 49, 54, 55, 475; bliss, 136; cause, 191; energy, 45; excellence, 136; intoxication, 83; person, 189, 190, 191; power, 36, 52; resignation, 86  
*surā*, 540  
*susadrśa-saṃsthāna*, 355  
*susadrśatvam*, 224  
 Sustained, 455  
 Sustainer, 455  
*susikṣita cārvaṅka*, 516, 540, 547  
*suṣumnā*, 59, 415  
*suṣumnā nādi*, 58  
*susupti*, 144, 178  
 Suta, 482  
 Sūtākhyā, 138  
*sūkṣma*, 61, 281  
*sūkṣma-kāla-guṇā-vasthā*, 42  
*Sūta-saṃhitā*, 19  
*sūtra*, 1, 108 n., 109, 116, 125, 140, 195, 196, 472, 480, 516, 518, 523 n., 532, 539; of Jaimini, 124  
*Sūtra-kṛtāṅga*, 524, 527, 528  
*Sūtra-kṛtāṅga-sūtra*, 521, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527; heretics referred to, in, 526  
*svabhāva*, 46  
 Svabhū, 402  
*Sva-dharmā-dhva-bodha*, 400 n., 401  
*svajanyatvam*, 372  
*svalakṣaṇa*, 255, 271  
*sva-līlayā*, 511  
*sva-mūrtāv api svayam eva hetuḥ*, 240  
*sva-prakāśa*, 230  
*svaprakāśatva*, 468  
*svarūpa*, 217 n., 347  
*svarūpa-dhī*, 217  
*svarūpa-sādrśya*, 224  
 Svarūpācārya, 401  
*svarūpāveśa*, 38  
*svastika*, 30, 60  
*svataḥ-pramāṇa*, 9; upheld by the Rāmānuja school, 247 *et seq.*  
*svataḥ-prāmāṇya*, 240, 347, 348, 356, 428  
*svataḥ-prāmāṇya-vāda*, 346; Meghan-ādārī's view, 346  
*svataṣṭva*, 428  
*sva-vilāsa*, 40 n.  
*svavilāsa-avatāra*, 40 n.  
*svayambhū*, 504  
 Svayambhuva, 21  
*svayam-prakāśa*, 167  
*svayam-rūpa*, 40 n.  
*svayam-siddha*, 214 n.  
*svābhāvika*, 434  
*svābhāvika bhedā-bheda-vāda*, 406  
*svādhyāya*, 62 n.  
*svālakṣaṇya*, 255

- svāmi-kṛpā*, 85  
*svāmī*, 86  
*svāmīśa*, 40 n.  
*svāmīśa-avatāra*, 40 n.  
*svārasika-bādhā-dṛṣṭer ananyathā-sid-dheśca*, 251  
*svārthā-numāna*, 427  
*svātantrya*, 506  
*svātantrya-mūla icchātmā*, 45  
 Sweetness, 226  
 Swoon, 169, 240  
*syādvāda-ratnākāra*, 536 n., 537 n.  
 Syllogism, 321  
 Symbol, 53, 326  
 Sympathy, 73, 120  
 Synonymous, 277  
 Synthesis, 187  
 Synthetic, 31, 47, 185, 501; associa-tion, 187  
 System, 32, 192, 297, 304, 347, 422, 451, 471, 482, 495, 516 n., 524 n., 527; of philosophy, 533  
 Systematic doctrine, 68  
*Śabara*, 124  
*Śabara Bhāṣya*, 349  
*Śabara Svāmīn*, 107  
*śabda*, 31, 49 n., 129, 233, 260 n., 426, 510, 511  
*Śabda-brahman*, 58  
*śabdu-mātra*, 510  
*śabda-pramāṇa*, 233  
*śabda-tan-mātra*, 48, 163, 259, 260, 261, 499, 504  
*Śaila-rāṅgeśa*, 94  
*Śaila-rāṅgeśa-guru*, 98 n.  
*Śaila Śrinivāsa*, 384, 385, 386, 388; his conception of causality, 385 *et seq.*; his criticism of Umā-Maheśvara, 396 *et seq.*; his refutation of Śaṅkarite attacks on Rāmānuja doctrine, 385 *et seq.*; his refutation of the objections to Rāmānuja's doctrine by various opponents, 392 *et seq.*  
*Śaiva*, 3 n., 18, 19, 105, 113, 155, 304, 525; hymns, 84; king, 104  
*Śaivism*, 18, 64, 81 n., 102 n., 399; its love of God distinguished from Ārvārs, 84; Mānikka-vāchakar's love of God, 84; of South India, 84  
*śakti*, 35, 36, 37, 38, 41, 43, 44, 45, 51, 52, 53, 56, 57, 155, 156, 197, 354, 507, 508, 509  
*Śaktyātman*, 40 n.  
*śakty-āveśa*, 38  
*Śālikanātha*, 185 n.  
*śauca*, 61, 62 n.  
*Śaṅkara*, 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 65, 105, 107, 108, 111, 112, 124, 125, 130, 165, 166, 173, 174, 195, 196, 198, 200, 204, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 317, 320, 322, 350, 381, 395, 417, 456, 471, 472, 476, 480, 484, 486, 487, 494, 496, 548; a crypto-Buddhist, 1; his *avidyā* refuted, 175 *et seq.*; his controversy with Rāmānuja on the nature of reality, 165 *et seq.*; his interpretation of causality, 3; his theory of illusion refuted, 179; literature, 405; philosophy 198, 316; school, 123, 142, 304, 312; system, 422; *Theory*, 422; view, 396  
*Śaṅkara-bhāṣya*, 198 n., 548 n.  
*Śaṅkara Vedānta*, 228, 403, 456  
*Śaṅkara-vijaya*, 2  
 Śaṅkarism, 143  
 Śaṅkarite epistemology, 9  
 Śaṅkarite view, 293, 387, 424  
 Śaṅkarites, 102, 113, 143, 144, 145, 153, 154, 155, 169, 173, 177, 178, 179, 188, 201, 204, 210, 223, 238, 239, 311, 313, 315, 318, 319, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 334, 336, 337, 340, 341, 343, 345, 346, 347, 350, 361, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 374, 385, 388, 394, 398, 409, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 428, 430, 434, 435, 456, 470, 478, 486  
*Śaṅkhiṇi*, 59  
*Śaraṇā-gati*, 55  
*Śaraṇā-gati-gadya*, 379, 380 n.  
*Śaraṇā-gati-gadyam*, 86 n.  
*śarīra*, 297, 298, 300, 389; its defini-tion, 297 *et seq.*  
*Śāstra-bhāvādihikaraṇa-vicāra*, 131  
 Śāntadāsa Vāvāji, 402  
*Śāstraka-mīmāṃsā-ṛṭhi*, 117  
*Śāstraka-nyāya-kalāpa*, 117, 132  
*Śāstraka-śāstrārtha-dīpikā*, 117, 127  
*Śāstraka-śāstra-saṃgati-śāra*, 117  
*Śāstra-vāda*, 133, 297 n., 298 n., 299 n., 300 n.  
*śāstra*, 21, 25, 56, 102, 161, 413, 503, 514, 530  
*Śāstraikya-vāda*, 133  
*śāstra-sampradāya-pravartaka*, 7 n.  
*Śāstrārambha-samarthana*, 133  
 Śāstri, Mr D., 531 n.  
 Śāstri, M. M. S. Kuppasvāmī, 106 n.  
*Sata-dūṣaṇī*, 117, 122, 123, 126, 130, 131, 305, 319 n., 396  
*Sata-dūṣaṇī-vyākhyā*, 131

- Sata-dūṣaṇī-vyākhyā-sahasra-kiraṇī*, 127  
*śataka*, 70  
*Satakoṭi-dūṣaṇa-parihāra*, 133  
*Satakoṭi-khaṇḍana*, 133  
*Sata-patha Brāhmaṇa*, 12  
*Śaṭhakopa*, 63, 65, 67 n., 69, 70, 71, 78, 94, 102 n., 108, 116, 138  
*Śaṭhakopa muni*, 130  
*Śaṭhakopa Yati*, 112, 123, 130  
*Śaṭhakopācārya*, 114, 139  
*Śaṭha-marṣaṇa*, 94 n., 129, 132  
*Śaṭhāri Sūri*, 130  
*Śavara*, 107, 108 n.  
*śākhā-candra-darśana*, 340  
*Śāktas*, 19  
*Śāmba-purāṇa*, 19  
*śānta*, 499  
*Śāntātman*, 40 n.  
*Śānti*, 37, 505, 523  
*Śānti-parvan*, 12, 260 n., 479  
*Śāṇḍilya*, 3, 17, 21, 25  
*Śāṇḍilyabhāskara*, 3 n.  
*Śāṇḍilya-smṛti*, 20  
*Śārada-maṭha*, 102  
*Śātātapa*, 20  
*śeṣa-śeṣitā*, 53  
*śeṣa-vṛtti-paratva*, 87 n.  
*Śeṣāryā*, 297  
*śeṣī*, 160  
*Śilpārtha-sāra*, 122  
*Śiṛiya-tiru-maḍal*, 69, 134 n.  
*Śiva*, 12, 16, 37, 38, 39, 40 n., 52, 84, 132, 232, 304, 475, 482, 483  
*Śiva-rātra*, 23  
*Śilāṅka*, 521, 523, 525, 526, 527  
*Śloka-vārttika*, 206 n.  
*Śoṭṭha-pūrṇa*, 97  
*śyaddhā*, 57, 382, 509, 550  
*Śramaṇa*, 527  
*śravaṇa*, 405, 442  
*Śravaṇa Bhaṭṭa*, 402  
*śrāddhas*, 530, 550  
*Śrāntabhāskara*, 3 n.  
*Śrīmadhura*, 98  
*Śrīyaḥ-pati-ppaḍi*, 135 n.  
*Śrī*, 37, 41, 57, 89, 99; its meaning, 89  
*Śrī-bhāṣya*, 103, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 120, 123, 125, 126, 128 n., 131, 132, 137, 175 n., 195 n., 200 n., 383  
*Śrī-bhāṣya-bhāvāṅkura*, 133  
*Śrī-bhāṣyopanyāsa*, 117  
*Śrī-bhāṣyā-ratha*, 138  
*Śrī-bhāṣya-sāra*, 117  
*Śrī-bhāṣya-sārārtha-saṃgraha*, 116, 117, 129  
*Śrī-bhāṣya-siddhānta-sāra*, 117  
*Śrī-bhāṣya-vārttika*, 117  
*Śrī-bhāṣya-vivṛti*, 114  
*Śrī-bhāṣya-vyākhyā*, 117  
*Śrībittiputtūr*, 69  
*Śrī Brahma*, 400  
*Śrīdhara*, 39, 529 n.  
*Śrīharṣa*, 111, 201, 549  
*Śrīkṛṣṇa*, 96, 430, 474  
*Śrīkṛṣṇa-deśika*, 112  
*Śrī-kṛṣṇastava*, 403  
*Śrīmad-bhagavad-gītā*, 113  
*Śrī-nātha*, 96  
*Śrīnivāsa*, 109, 115, 116, 118, 127, 129, 130, 236 n., 297, 386, 387, 392, 393, 399, 401, 402, 403, 406 n.; pupil of Mahācārya, his works, 127, 128  
*Śrīnivāsadāsa*, 123, 127, 129; his works, 127  
*Śrīnivāsa-dīkṣita*, 115, 130, 396  
*Śrīnivāsa Rāghavadāsa*, 129  
*Śrīnivāsa Sūri*, 121  
*Śrīnivāsa Tātācārya*, 116, 384  
*Śrīnivāsa-tāyārya*, 396  
*Śrīnivāsa-yati*, 138  
*Śrīnivāsācārya*, 114, 117, 123  
*Śrī-pañca-rātra-rakṣā*, 122  
*Śrīpati*, 40 n.  
*Śrīraṅgam*, 69, 97, 98, 101, 102, 103, 104, 110, 113, 120, 121, 135, 137  
*Śrī-raṅga-nātha*, 94 n., 121 n.  
*Śrīraṅganātha-gāyaka*, 109  
*Śrīraṅganāyaki*, 110  
*Śrī Rangasūri*, 381  
*Śrīraṅgācārya*, 111, 117  
*Śrīrāma*, 39 n.  
*Śrī Rāma Pillai*, 109 n., 111  
*Śrī Rāmānuja Pillan*, 110  
*Śrī-rāmānuja-yogi-pāda*, 395 n.  
*Śrī Rāmānujācārya*, 104 n.  
*Śrīśailadāsa*, 130  
*Śrīśaila lineage*, 109, 115, 122, 131  
*Śrīśailanātha*, 110, 111  
*Śrīśailapūrṇa*, 98, 102 n., 109  
*Śrīśaila Rāghavārya*, 130  
*Śrīśaila Śrīnivāsa*, 18, 111, 115, 127, 133, 388, 389 n., 392  
*Śrīśaila Tātāyārya*, 18, 130, 131  
*Śrīśaila Yogendra*, 129  
*Śrīśaileśa*, 137  
*Śrīśudarśana Press*, 305  
*Śrī-tattva-darpana*, 133  
*Śrīvacana - bhūṣaṇa - vyākhyā*, 135, 375 n., 376 n., 377 n., 378 n., 379 n.  
*Śrīvacana-bhūṣaṇa*, 90 n., 135, 137, 138, 374, 375 n., 380 n.  
*Śrīvaiṣṇava*, 18, 19, 24, 95, 99, 102,

*Śrīvaiṣṇava (cont.)*

- 107, 108, 112, 120, 125, 135, 138, 304, 305, 379; many works written in defence against the Śaivas, 18; philosophy, 22; school, 134; system, 136; their quarrel with the Śaivas, 18
- Śrī-vaiṣṇavism, 89, 102 n., 105, 127
- Śrīvallabhadeva, 65
- Śrīvatsa, 57
- Śrīvatsa-siddhānta-sāra, 113, 116
- Śrīvatsāṅka, 139
- Śrīvatsāṅka Miśra, 102, 105, 108, 109, 129
- Śrīvatsāṅka Śrīnivāsa, 116
- Śrīvatsāṅka Śrīnivāsācārya, 117
- Śrīvānācala Yogīndra, 138
- Śrīvāsaguru, 112
- Śrīveṅkaṭaguru, 112
- Śrīveṅkaṭācārya, 112
- Śrīveṅkaṭeśa, 112
- Śrīviṣṇucitta, 114
- Śrūta-bhāva-prakāśikā, 127
- Śrūta-pradīpikā, 130
- Śrūta-prakāśikā, 109 n., 111, 113, 114, 115, 120, 126, 127, 128 n., 130, 131, 136, 137, 157, 176 n., 177 n., 179 n., 180, 181 n., 186 n., 188, 298
- Śrūta-prakāśikācārya, 135
- Śrūta-prakāśikā of Sudarśana Sūri, 392
- Śrūta-prakāśikā-sāra-saṃgraha, 114
- Śruti, 352 n., 371; texts, 390
- Śruti-dīpikā, 115
- Śruti-siddhānta-mañjarī, 403 n.
- Śruti-siddhānta-saṃgraha, 240, 441 n., 442 n., 443 n.
- Śruty-anta-sura-druma, 403, 404
- śuddha-brahma, 197
- śuddha-sarga, 27
- Śuddhasattva Lakṣmaṇācārya, 115
- Śuddhasattvalakṣaṇārya, 131 n.
- Śuddhasattva Yogīndra, 115
- Śuddhasattvācārya, 131 n.
- śuddhetarā-sṛṣṭi, 42
- śuddhi, 464
- śuddhy-aśuddhimaya, 44
- Śukra, 482, 503, 531 n.
- Śukranīti, 515
- Śukra-nīti-sāra, 515 n.
- Śuktyamśa, 183
- Śūdra, 20, 64, 68, 98, 104
- śūnyatvarūpiṇī, 36
- Śūnya-vāda, 177, 206 n.
- śūnya-vādi, 201
- Śveta-dvīpa, 13, 19, 443 n.
- Śvetāśvatara, 379, 472, 473, 512
- Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, 447 n.

*Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣat-prakāśikā, 127*

- Śyāma Bhaṭṭa, 402
- Śyāmadeva, 402
- Śyāmācārya, 401
- śad-aṅga-yoga, 24
- śad-guṇa, 37
- Tactile, 253, 254; organ, 459; sensation, 253
- tad-āyatta-sthīti-pūrvikā, 406
- tad-bhāvā-patti, 420
- tadvikāratva, 266
- tad-vyāpyatva, 431
- tajjasa, 25, 48, 498, 510
- Taittirīya-prakāśikā, 402
- Taittirīya Upaniṣad, 402
- Taittirīyo-paniṣat, 131, 379
- Taittirīyo-paniṣat-bhāṣya, 138
- Taittirīyo-paniṣat-prakāśikā, 127
- Taivattuk-k-arasu-Nambi, 97 n.
- tajjanyatva, 266
- tamas, 25, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 129, 163, 259, 447, 466, 469, 471, 473, 474, 475, 480, 482, 491, 500, 501, 513, 504, 505, 507
- tamasa mahat, 498
- Tamil, 63 n., 64, 66, 95, 96, 102, 105, 107, 110, 111 n., 121, 124, 125, 131, 134, 137
- Tamil Veda, 95
- tamoguno, 448 n.
- tamomaya, 46
- Tangible, 5, 500
- Tani-praṇava, 135 n.
- Tanjore, 67
- tanmātra, 25, 43, 156, 163, 256, 259, 260 n., 445, 499, 502, 504, 507, 510, 511
- tantra, 107
- tantu-samavetatvāt, 256
- tapah, 62 n.
- tapas, 55, 450, 503
- Tapta-mudrā-vidrāvaṇa, 396 n.
- tarka, 227, 537
- tarkavidyā, 515
- tarkī, 518
- Taste, 251
- Taste-potential, 48, 163, 510
- Tatar-āṇṇar, 137
- tathā-bhūta, 348
- tathātva, 357
- Tat-kratu-nyāya-vicāra, 131, 133
- Tattva-bhāṣkara, 132
- Tattva-candrikā, 396 n.
- Tattva-dīpa, 89, 132
- Tattva-dīpana, 128 n.
- Tattva-dīpa-saṃgraha-kārikā, 132

- tattva-jñāna*, 143  
*Tattva-kaustubha*, 19 n., 20  
*Tattva-mārtanda*, 115  
*Tattva-mātrkā*, 123, 124  
*Tattva-muktā-kalāpa*, 119, 120, 122, 124, 131, 251, 256 n., 257 n., 303 n., 304 n., 346  
*Tattva-navanītam*, 123  
*Tattva-nirṇaya*, 128 n., 133, 352, 352 n.  
*Tattva-nirūpaṇa*, 261  
*Tattva-padavi*, 123  
*Tattva-pradīpikā*, 318  
*Tattva-prakāśikā*, 402  
*Tattva-prakāśikā-veda-stuti-śikā*, 402  
*Tattva-ratnākara*, 119, 128 n., 210, 214 n., 216 n., 226, 227, 228, 229, 232 n., 234  
*Tattva-ratnāvalī*, 124  
*Tattva-ratnāvalī-saṃgraha*, 124  
*Tattva-saṃgraha*, 516 n., 544 n.  
*Tattva-saṃkhyāna*, 23  
*Tattva-sandēśa*, 124  
*Tattva-sāra*, 114, 116, 132, 352  
*Tattva-śekhara*, 135, 136, 137  
*Tattva-śikha-maṇi*, 124  
*Tattva-śikā*, 105 n., 114, 120, 123  
*Tattva-traya*, 39, 40 n., 41, 43 n., 56, 57, 125 n., 135, 137, 138, 157, 159 n., 160 n., 260 n., 261 n.; *vyūha* doctrine in, 39 n.  
*Tattva-traya-bhāṣya*, 135  
*Tattva-traya-cūluka*, 124, 125, 128 n.  
*Tattva-traya-cūluka-saṃgraha*, 125  
*Tattva-traya-nirūpaṇa*, 128 n.  
*Tattva-traya-pracaṇḍa-māruta*, 128 n.  
*Tattva-triveka-śikā-vivaraṇa*, 1  
*Tattvārtha-sāra*, 96 n.  
*Tattvārtha-śloka-vārtika*, 546, 547 n.  
*taṣastha*, 51, 377  
*tādātmyā-dhyāna*, 334  
*tāmasa*, 31, 163, 510  
*tāmasa ahaṃkāra*, 259, 260  
*tāmasa śāstra*, 22  
*tāmisra*, 500  
*Tāmrāparṇi*, 63, 95  
*Tāntric system*, 57  
*Tāntric works*, 58  
*Tārāsāropaniṣad*, 13  
*Tātācārya*, 98, 109, 131, 132  
*Tātācārya-dīna-caryā*, 131  
*Tātārya*, 129  
*Tātāyārya*, 115, 126  
*Tātparya-candrikā*, 123  
*Tātparya-dīpikā*, 114, 116, 118, 123, 132, 380 n.  
*Tautology*, 372  
*Teacher*, 62, 102, 122, 124, 182, 235, 400, 405  
*tejas*, 35, 37, 40 n., 49 n., 56, 163, 181, 260, 261; substance, 188  
*Teleological*, 470  
*Teleology*, 30, 261, 459, 472, 473  
*Telugu Brahmin*, 399  
*Temper*, 548  
*Temple*, 17, 18, 58, 69, 96, 104, 111, 121  
*Temple-building*, 17  
*Temple-gods*, 18  
*Temple-keepers*, 121  
*Temporal*, 42, 313, 314, 324, 353; character, 284, 285, 331, 353; conditions, 343; contiguity, 316; identity, 252; relations, 321; succession, 274  
*Temporary*, 495  
*Tendency*, 30, 34, 45, 51, 210, 288, 349, 449, 550  
*Tender equality*, 84  
*Tenets*, 524 n.  
*Tengalai*, 120, 380, 381, 382; school, 120; their difference with the Vadalgalai is based on the greater or less emphasis on *prapatti*, 86-7  
*Terms of reference*, 419  
*Test*, 341  
*Testimony*, 192, 196, 203, 211, 247, 289, 290, 303, 310, 326, 390, 426, 465, 485, 547  
*"Tettarumtiral,"* 67  
*Text*, 340, 350, 398, 438, 446  
*Textual criticism*, 388  
*Theism*, 451, 472  
*Theistic*, 189, 196, 480; tendency, 451  
*Theological*, 303; dogma, 395  
*Theory*, 28, 30, 179, 180, 181, 183, 184, 187, 210, 291, 296, 308, 331, 348, 351, 352, 413, 421, 426, 515 n., 516, 520, 543; illusion, 237, 238, 239, 241; of knowledge, 238  
*Thesis*, 315, 322, 416, 419, 420, 427, 512  
*Thief*, 213  
*Thing itself*, 186  
*Things*, 34, 45 n., 48, 190, 192, 193, 195  
*"This,"* 180, 184, 185 n.  
*Thomas, Dr F. W.*, 531, 532  
*Thought*, 32, 46, 47, 53, 61, 304, 460  
*Thought-activity*, 44, 50, 51, 53  
*Thought-experiences*, 385  
*Thought-movement*, 44

- Threads, 197  
 Tides, 228  
 Tikalakkidandān-tirunāvīruḍaiyāpīraṇ-  
   Tātar-aṇṇar, 137  
*tilakālaka*, 56  
 Time, 27, 34, 35, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47,  
   51, 56, 82, 185 n., 195, 199, 228,  
   252, 273, 277, 278, 279, 284, 285,  
   286, 287, 309, 348, 349, 389, 447,  
   448, 472, 473, 489, 504, 515  
 Time-conception, 285  
 Time-energy, 45  
 Timeless, 72, 447, 473  
 Time-moments, 274  
 Time-units, 286  
 Tinnevely, 68, 137  
*Tiru-chaṇḍa-vruttam*, 68, 134 n.  
 Tirukkovalur, 103  
 Tirukkurgur, 65  
 Tirukkurukaippiran Pillai, 134  
*Tirukkurun-dāṇḍakam*, 69, 134 n.  
 Tirukkurungudi, 103  
 Tirukurugaipiran Pillai, 109 n., 110  
 Tirumalācārya, 133  
*Tirumal-Tiru-mōri*, 76  
*Tiru-mantra-churukku*, 94  
 Tiru-maṅgaiy, 66, 69, 77  
 Tiru-maṅgaiy-āṅvār, 63, 64, 65, 66 n.,  
   67, 68, 70, 83, 134 n., 137  
 Tiru-maṅṇai, 63  
 Tiru-maṅṇai Pīraṇ, 63, 64, 65, 66 n.,  
   68, 96 n., 106 n., 134 n.  
*Tiru-mālai*, 69, 134 n.  
*Tiru-mōri*, 69  
 Tirunarayanapperumāl, 104  
*Tiru-neḍum-dāṇḍakam*, 69, 134 n.  
 Tirunirmalai, 103  
*Tiru-pall'-āṇḍu*, 69  
*Tiru-palliy-eṛuchi*, 69, 134 n.  
 Tirupati, 103  
 Tiru-pān-āṅvār, 63, 64, 65, 66, 68, 69,  
   134 n.  
*Tiru-pāvai*, 69, 77  
*Tiruppalavai-vyākhyāna*, 127  
 Tiruppāvai, 134 n.  
 Tiruppullani, 103  
 Tirupputkūḷi, 103  
 Tiruvaigundipuram, 103  
 Tiruvallikēni, 103  
 Tiruvanandapuram, 103  
*Tiru-vantādi*, 68, 134 n.  
 Tiruvappariśāram, 103  
*Tiruvarangattamudanār*, 137  
 Tiruvaṭṭar, 103  
*Tiru-vācha kam*, 84  
*Tiruvārādhana-krama*, 138  
*Tiru-vāṣiṇyam*, 69, 134  
*Tiruvāymōri-nurundādi*, 138  
*Tiru-vāy-mōri*, 66, 69, 79, 80 n., 105,  
   109 n., 110, 134 n., 137  
*Tiruveḷukūr-tirukkai*, 134 n.  
*Tiru-veṟugātt-irukkai*, 69  
*Tiru-vṛttam*, 69, 74, 134 n.  
*tiryag*, 501  
*tiryak-srotas*, 501, 502  
 Toḍappā, 110  
 Toṇḍar-adi-pōḍiy-āṅvār, 63, 64, 65,  
   66 n., 68, 69, 134 n.  
 Toṇḍānūr, 104  
 Totality, 264  
 Totārambā, 110, 119, 122  
 Touch, 251  
 Touch-potential, 48, 260, 504  
 Toy, 167  
 Tradition, 57, 63, 104 n., 496, 515 n.  
 Traditional, 64, 65  
*traigunya*, 46  
*Trai-rāsikas*, 523  
 Traits, 195, 212  
 Trance, 30, 79  
 Transcendent, 39, 41, 44, 47, 99, 156,  
   175, 195, 197, 391, 426, 455, 507,  
   536; beauty, 83; Brahman, 10;  
   nature, 413; reality, 550; self, 468;  
   world, 536  
 Transcendental, 24, 30, 38, 448, 453,  
   468; cause, 502; form, 73  
 Transformation, 2, 6, 10, 36, 37, 47,  
   156, 182, 196, 197, 199, 281, 286,  
   298, 302, 332, 341, 368, 371, 385,  
   386, 393, 395, 396, 397, 416, 440,  
   454, 456, 487  
 Transformer, 45 n.  
 Transforming entities, 385  
 Transition, 349  
 Transitoriness, 28  
 Transmigrations, 291  
 Transmission, 287  
 Transparent, 46  
*trasareṇu*, 155, 163, 263  
 Travancore, 66, 67  
 Treaties, 86  
 Treatment, 207, 297, 426  
 Tricky, 513  
*tridaṇḍa*, 1, 549; its meaning, 1 n.  
 Tridaṇḍī Brahmins, their views, 2  
*tridaṇḍī*, 2, 532  
*triḡuṇa*, 259, 497  
*triḡuṇā-tmikā prakṛti*, 491  
*Trikālika*, 497  
 Trikaṇḍamaṇḍana, 3 n.  
 Trinity, 46, 47  
 Tripartite, 29, 47 200; union,  
   46

- Tripād-vibhūti-mahānārāyaṇa Upani-  
śad*, 13  
Triplicane, 68  
Trivikrama, 39, 40 n.  
*trivṛt-karaṇa*, 182, 183, 188, 240  
Triyaga, 440  
True, 194, 208, 316, 331, 424, 437,  
457, 471, 482, 507; adoration, 54;  
cause, 338; knowledge, 160, 178,  
330, 331, 347, 429, 450, 491, 492,  
506; wisdom, 416  
Trustworthy, 357  
Truth, 5, 8, 202, 308, 313, 326, 335,  
413, 478, 517, 529  
Truthfulness, 29  
Tryambaka, 130  
*Trṃśa-praśno-ttara*, 133  
*trṃśa*, 501  
*trṣā*, 48  
*tuccha*, 239, 241  
Tucci, Dr G., 512 n.  
Tuppu, 118  
*tuṣṭi*, 57  
*Tuvalū*, 78  
*Talikā*, 126, 114, 131 n.  
Twinkle, 378  
*Tyāga-śabdārtha-ṭippaṇi*, 130  
Types, 51; of soul, 61  
Tanka, 1 n., 108, 139
- Udak-pratoḥi-kṛṣṇa, 110  
Udayana, 1, 2, 539  
*udāharaṇa*, 427  
*udāna*, 59, 60  
Udāyī-kunḍīyāṇīya, 525 n.  
Uddyotakara, 212 n.  
*Ujvala*, 52  
*Ujvala-nīla-maṇi*, 82  
Ukkalammal, 105  
Ukkal Ārvān, 105  
Ultimate, 42, 52, 509; antecedent, 397;  
attainment, 38; consciousness, 420,  
457; destiny, 383; emancipation, 38;  
end, 136, 416; goal, 100, 136; ideal,  
414; object, 464; principle, 451;  
state, 445; truth, 196, 327, 426,  
468; union, 429  
Ultimate reality, 24, 25, 27, 31, 37,  
165, 197, 406, 450, 457, 460, 497,  
507, 509 n.; as *nirviśeṣa* and *sarīṣeṣa*,  
165 *et seq.*; as unqualified, refuted,  
173-5  
Ultimately real, 197, 200, 371  
Ultra-sensual, 225  
Umā-Maheśvara, 395, 396; his criti-  
cism of Rāmānuja, 396  
Unaffectedness, 37  
Unassociated Brahman, 430  
Unborn, 291  
Uncaused, 299  
Uncertainty, 370, 398  
Unchangeable, 34, 46, 196, 301, 323,  
469, 549; unity, 287  
Unconditional, 203, 226, 272, 390,  
485, 497, 533, 535  
Unconditioned, 272  
Unconscious, 26, 27, 29, 41, 79, 408,  
416, 546; power, 43; world, 429  
Unconsciousness, 150  
Uncontradicted, 251, 314, 358; ex-  
perience, 246  
Uncontradictory, 236  
Understanding, 462, 463, 539  
Undifferentiated, 35, 200, 372, 495;  
consciousness, 238  
Unfavourable effects, 292  
Uniformity, 278  
Unintelligent, 25, 26  
Unintelligible, 144  
Union, 33, 38, 53  
Unique, 189, 193, 316, 424, 454  
Uniqueness, 255, 455  
Unit of time, 273  
Unitary, 545  
Units, 420  
Unity, 25, 26, 31, 42, 46, 53, 192, 193,  
194, 413, 414, 418, 419, 434, 456,  
459, 460, 461, 462, 506, 508; of a  
flame, 343; of being, 175; of con-  
sciousness, 345; texts, 307, 308, 309,  
310  
Unity-in-difference, 28, 30, 405  
Universal, 45, 86, 193, 217, 218, 224,  
243, 254, 279, 312, 323, 341, 355,  
356, 387, 460, 493, 535, 536, 537,  
538; agreement, 229; cognition, 358;  
concomitance, 228, 230, 533; con-  
sciousness, 198; destruction, 169;  
existence, 345; experience, 219, 319;  
illumination, 198; negation, 272,  
328; proposition, 225  
Universality, 298  
Universe, 32, 35, 41, 45 n., 53, 56, 87,  
190, 191, 195, 197, 239, 315, 412,  
434, 454, 455, 456, 457, 459, 460,  
472, 475, 484, 492, 499, 500, 507,  
508, 511  
Unknowable, 230 n., 499  
Unlimited, 10; servitude, 88  
Unproduced, 204  
Unprohibited food, 61  
Unqualified, 165, 430  
Unreal, 2, 179, 181, 194, 314, 330, 332,  
338, 339, 346, 433, 436, 456, 458, 487

- Unreality, 5, 201, 210, 332, 458  
 Unreasonableness, 177 n.  
 Unrelatedness, 466  
 Unseen merit, 292  
 Unspeakable, 35  
 Untouchables, 104  
 Unvedic, 472  
*uñcha-vṛtti*, 119  
*Upadeśa-ratna-mālā*, 64, 94 n.  
*Upadeśa-ratna-mālā*, 134, 135, 138, 482  
*upahitasvarūpa*, 306  
*Upakāra-saṃgraha*, 124  
*upamāna*, 234, 426, 427; upheld by  
     Meghanādāri, 234  
*upamitti*, 128  
*Upaniṣad(s)*, 5, 12, 13, 16, 101, 105,  
     126, 146, 148, 153, 154, 182, 196,  
     211, 291, 293, 296, 387, 394, 398,  
     442, 446, 447, 463, 464, 465, 468,  
     471, 480, 481, 496, 512, 519  
*Upaniṣad-bhāṣya*, 127  
*Upaniṣad-brahmayogin*, 13  
*Upaniṣadic*, 112, 113, 126, 208, 240,  
     392, 519; texts, 201, 394, 405, 479,  
     480, 487  
*Upaniṣadists*, 211  
*Upaniṣad-maṅgala-dīpikā*, 126  
*Upaniṣad texts*, 381, 464  
*Upaniṣad-vākya-vivaraṇa*, 127  
*Upaniṣat-prakāśikā*, 127  
*upasargas*, 505  
*Upavarṣa*, 7 n., 105, 107, 108  
*Upavarṣācārya*, 7 n.  
*upavāsa*, 33  
*upādāna*, 2, 191, 196, 388, 391  
*upādāna-kārṇaṇa*, 157, 454, 484  
*upādhi*, 269, 278, 301, 386, 413, 422,  
     432, 453, 478, 479, 481, 489, 492,  
     508 n., 534, 535, 561  
*upādhi-rūpa*, 216  
*upāsaka*, 89  
*upāsana*, 293, 381  
*upāya*, 376  
*upāya-jñāna*, 55  
*upāya stage*, 377 n., 378  
*upāya-svarūpa-jñāna*, 88 n.  
*upāya-sūnyatā*, 87  
*Upendra Bhaṭṭa*, 401  
*upeya*, 377  
 Upper India, 19  
*Uraipūr*, 67  
 Usage, 334  
*Uśanas*, 532  
*utpatti*, 199  
*uttama*, 505  
*Uttara-kalārya*, 381, 382, 383  
*uttara-mantrin*, 65  
*Uttara-mīmāṃsā*, 350  
*Uttara-nārāyaṇa*, 57  
*uttara-vibhāga*, 482  
*Uvāsagadaśō*, 522, 524  
*Uyyakkonḍār*, 67 n., 97  
*ūha*, 214  
*ūrdhva-srotas*, 501  
 Vacuity, 36, 353  
 Vadari, 77  
 Vadarikāśrama, 482  
*vadhū*, 47  
*Vaḍagalai*, their difference with the  
     Teṅgalai is based on the greater or  
     less emphasis on *prapatti*, 86–7  
*Vaḍakalai*, 67, 120, 121, 381  
*Vaḍavāvakra*, 40 n.  
*vahni*, 510  
*vahnitva*, 535  
*vahusṛuta*, 530  
*Vaibhava-prakāśikā*, 121 n.  
*Vaibhāṣika Buddhists*, 251  
*vaidhi*, 378  
*vaidiki*, 507  
*vaidūla-vratika*, 518  
*Vaiḡai*, 63  
*Vaijayanṭi*, 105 n.  
*vaikārika*, 48, 498, 499, 504, 510  
*vaikārika-indriya-sarga*, 502 n.  
*Vaikhānasa*, 22, 57  
*Vaikunṭha*, 50, 93  
*Vairamegha*, 67  
*Vairamegha Pallava*, 66  
*vairāgya*, 33, 47, 63  
*Vaiśeṣika*, 208, 456, 467; supposed, 163  
*Vaiśvadeva-kārikā*, 122  
*Vaiṣṇava*, 12, 39 n., 63, 65, 83, 87, 98,  
     104, 105, 293, 379; commentators,  
     1 n.; literature, 10; marks, 22; rites,  
     102; systems, 139; temple, 65, 138;  
     tradition, 99 n.; writers, 192  
*Vaiṣṇava Upaniṣads*, 13; division of, 13  
*Vaiṣṇavism*, 13, 63 n., 64, 81 n., 96 n.,  
     105, 110, 139, 399, 451  
*Vaiṣṇavite Reformers of India*, 119 n.  
*Vakula-bharaṇa*, 139  
*Valadeva*, 482  
*Valid*, 185 n., 202, 203, 208, 468, 533,  
     537, 539; inference, 537; know-  
     ledge, 236, 248, 467, 469; memory,  
     237; perception, 215  
*Validity*, 16, 190, 201, 202, 203, 213,  
     216, 229, 230, 238, 247, 248, 250,  
     321, 326, 346, 347, 348, 356, 357,  
     428, 457, 458, 495, 534, 536, 537,  
     539; its nature as treated by Me-  
     ghanādāri, 215–16; of cognition, 249

- Vallabha, 400, 475, 496  
 Value, 464, 472  
 Vanamamalai-jiyar, 111  
 Vanamāli Miśra, 440, 441 n.; his interpretation of Nimbārka philosophy, 440 *et seq.*  
 Vangi-puratt-acchi, 97 n.  
 Vanity, 529  
 Vañjikulam, 67  
 Varada, 98, 157, 159, 352  
 Varadadāsa, 132  
 Varada Deśikācārya, 125  
 Varadaguru, 111, 125  
 Varadakṛṣṇa, his definition of perception, 216  
 Varadanārāyaṇa, 208; his view of doubt, 208  
 Varada Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭāraka, 119  
 Varadanātha, 111, 118, 123, 125, 380  
 Varadanāyaka Sūri, 125  
 Varadarāja, 78  
 Varadarāja Sūri, 125  
 Varadarāt, 114 n., 125  
 Varadaviṣṇu, 109, 111, 216  
 Varadaviṣṇu Miśra, 109, 111, 119, 180, 212 n., 214 n., 217, 226, 229, 234, 383 n.  
 Varada Viṣṇu Sūri, 131  
 Varadācārya, 93 n., 102, 119  
 Varadārya, 112, 118, 119, 125  
 Varagalai, 381  
 varaṇadāśā, 379  
 Varavara, 39, 41, 94 n., 157, 159 n., 160, 163, 260, 261; his view of time, 163  
 Varavara muni, 110, 135, 136, 137  
 Varavara-muni-campu, 138  
 Varavara-muni-dinacaryā, 138  
 Varavara-muni-kāya, 138  
 Varavara-muni-śataka, 138  
 Varāha, 16, 20, 39 n., 40 n., 523  
 Varāha Mihira, 523  
 Vararaṅga, 97, 109 n.  
 Variable, 243  
 Variability, 243  
 varṇa, 293  
 varṇaka, 515  
 varṇikā, 516  
 varṭtikā, 516  
 Varuṇa, 59, 295  
 vastu, 250 n.  
 Vasiṣṭha, 21, 23, 482  
 Vasiṣṭha-saṃhitā, 19  
 Vatsabhāskara, 3 n.  
 Vaṭapūrṇa, 104, 109  
 Vācaspati, 3, 196, 467, 476, 517 n., 533  
 vācārambhanam, 3  
 vācika, 507  
 vāda, 381, 512, 513  
 Vādādri-kulīśa, 127  
 vādassādāna, 513 n.  
 vādha, 314, 501  
 Vādhūla, 109  
 Vādhūla gotra, 98, 110, 114 n.  
 Vādhūla-kula-tilaka, 127 n.  
 Vādhūla Narasiṃgha-guru, 114  
 Vādhūla Narasiṃha, 132  
 Vādhūla Śrīnivāsa, 114, 117, 123, 126, 131 n., 135, 305  
 Vādhūla Varadaguru, 114  
 Vādhūla varada Nārāyaṇaguru, 138  
 Vādhūla Venkaṭācārya, 114  
 Vādideva, 536  
 Vādideva Sūri, 536 n., 537 n.  
 Vādihaṃsa, 111; his conception of *jāti*, 354; his view of *svataḥ-prāmāṇya vāda*, 356 *et seq.*; his view of *svaprakāśatva*, 358 *et seq.*  
 Vādi-haṃsa-navāmvuda, 352, 361; his notion of negation, 352  
 Vādihaṃsāmbuvāha, 117, 184, 185, 187; his treatment of illusion, 184 *et seq.*  
 Vādihaṃsāmbuvāha Rāmānujācārya, 186 n.  
 Vādihaṃsāmbuvāhācārya, 118, 119, 183, 187  
 Vādikesari, 135, 138  
 Vādikesari Miśra, 132  
 Vādi-traya-khaṇḍana, 124, 193 n., 305  
 Vādivijaya, 111  
 vādi-vipratipattiḥ, 212 n.  
 Vāgīśvara, 40 n.  
 Vāgvijaya, 118, 130  
 vākavākya, 517  
 vākya-kāra, 106, 107  
 Vākya-padīya, 517 n.  
 Vākyārtha-saṃgraha, 130  
 Vāmana, 39, 40 n.  
 Vāmanadeva, 40 n., 146  
 Vāṇvilāsa Press 1910, 380 n.  
 Vāraṇasī, 110, 114 n.  
 vārtā, 532  
 vārttika, 515  
 vārttikasūtra, 515, 516  
 vāsanā, 26, 27, 33, 34, 43, 51, 54, 253, 273, 308, 453, 487  
 Vāsudeva, 2, 13, 16, 17, 21, 27, 29, 31, 34, 37, 38, 39, 42 n., 57, 155, 157, 158, 443 n., 474, 475, 497, 506, 508  
 Vāsudeva-vyūha, 474  
 Vāsudevendra, 13  
 Vāsudevopaniṣad, 13  
 Vāsiṣṭha, 20

- vāta*, 475  
*vātsalya*, 89  
*Vātsīputriya*, 251  
*Vātsya*, 119, 207  
*Vātsya Anantārya*, 126  
*Vātsya gotra*, 111, 112  
*Vātsya Nṛsimhadeva*, 122  
*Vātsya Śrīnivāsa*, 112, 203; his notion of class-concepts, 297; his treatment of *pramāṇa*, 203  
*Vātsya Varada*, 110, 111, 114, 116, 118, 119, 130, 132, 349, 350, 351, 380; his analysis of the concept of difference, 351; his notion of God, 351; his refutation of Śrīharṣa's view of the falsity of the world, 350; his refutation of the denial of the category of difference, 350; his view of *bidhi*, 349-50  
*Vātsya Varadaguru*, 109  
*Vātsyāyana*, 208, 212 n., 235  
*Vātsyāyana-bhāṣya*, 207 n.  
*vāyu*, 7, 48, 49 n., 59, 60, 163, 253, 261, 499, 504, 505, 510  
*Vāyu purāṇa*, 20, 502, 503, 505, 506 n.; its philosophy, 502 *et seq.*  
*Veda*, 2, 14, 15, 16, 18, 21, 24, 25, 62, 88, 124, 165, 198 n., 203, 347, 349, 357, 401, 429, 441, 471, 515, 517, 530, 531  
*veda-nindaka*, 519  
*Vedas* instructed by God, 15  
*Vedavid*, 40 n.  
*veda-vidāṃ matam*, 181  
*Vedavyāsa Bhaṭṭa*, 111, 130  
*Vedānta*, 1, 8, 96, 97, 100, 115, 117, 125, 130, 138, 197, 200, 305, 307, 352, 401, 403, 406, 416, 462, 466, 471, 480, 481, 482, 496, 508 n.; in relation to Sāṃkhya according to Vijñāna Bhikṣu, 471 *et seq.*; its *bhedābheda* interpretation, 105 *et seq.*; dialectic, 153; view, 235  
*Vedānta-deśika*, 119, 361  
*Vedānta - deśika - vaibhava - prakāśikā*, 121 n., 131  
*Vedānta-kṛpa*, 103, 113, 118, 159, 201, 349  
*Vedāntaguru*, 112  
*Vedānta-kaṇṭako-dhāra*, 131  
*Vedānta-kaustubha*, 130, 132, 402  
*Vedānta-kaustubha-prabhā*, 402, 415 n., 416  
*Vedāntakārikāvali*, 132  
*Vedāntamañjuṣā*, 404 n.  
*Vedānta-paribhāṣā*, 9, 204, 216  
*Vedānta-pārijāta-sūtraleha*, 400, 402  
*Vedānta-ratna-mañjuṣā*, 403, 411, 412  
*Vedānta Rāmānuja*, 18, 132, 380  
*Vedānta-saṃgraha*, 113  
*Vedānta-saṃgraha-tātparyā-dīpikā*, 130  
*Vedānta-sāra*, 103, 113, 118, 349  
*Vedānta-siddhānta-pradīpa*, 400, 403  
*Vedānta-siddhānta-saṃgraha*, 440  
*Vedānta-sūtra*, 2, 56 n., 476, 484  
*Vedānta-tattva-vodha*, 400, 408, 409 n., 410 n., 411 n.  
*Vedānta-vijaya*, 117, 126, 128 n., 130  
*Vedāntācārya*, 119, 132  
*Vedāntic*, 111, 438, 461, 467; instructions, 308; schools, 385; texts, 61, 337; view, 464; writers, 385  
*Vedāntin*, 109  
*Vedāntists*, 139, 156, 465, 477  
*Vedānti Mādhava*, 134, 135  
*Vedānti Mādhavadāsa*, 110 n.  
*Vedārtha-saṃgraha*, 101, 103, 106, 107, 118, 128 n., 130, 160, 201, 218, 305  
*Vedic*, 16, 17, 18, 43 n., 57, 293, 518, 549; circles, 530; cult, 518; doctrines, 517, 519; duties, 15, 165, 404, 416, 429; injunctions, 165, 349, 350, 441; people, 19, 20, 531; religion, 40, 95; rites, 14, 20; sacrifices, 517, 522, 549; school, 181; science, 531 n.; scriptures, 366; sects, 20; texts, 17, 112, 390, 391, 394  
*Vegetables*, 97 n.  
*Veil*, 366, 371, 372, 374  
*Veiling*, 369; agent, 369  
*Veṅkaṭa*, 18, 63 n., 66 n., 67, 94, 96 n., 98 n., 99, 105 n., 107, 110, 111, 114, 115, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121 n., 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 130, 131, 132, 135, 155, 157, 159, 161, 163, 183, 201, 203, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212 n., 213, 214, 216, 217, 219 n., 220, 221, 223, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236 n., 238, 240, 241, 250 n., 251, 254, 255, 256, 257, 261, 262, 263, 265, 268 n., 269, 270, 277, 280, 281, 282, 286, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 295, 296, 297, 301, 302, 303, 305, 306, 307, 308, 311, 313, 314, 316, 317, 318, 319, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 340, 342, 344, 346, 352, 353, 355, 356, 380, 381, 382, 383, 426; analysis of momentariness, 273 *et seq.*; an upholder of *anvita-bhīdāna-vāda*, 233; a constructor of Rāmānuja logic, 235; conclusive remarks on

## Veṅkaṭa (cont.)

doubt, 208 *et seq.*, decision, nature of, 210; definition of *pramāṇa*, 236; doubt and *ūha*, 214; error, definition of, 210; error and doubt, relation, 208 *et seq.*; his agreement with the *Pañcarātra* view of God, 303; his admission of three *pramāṇas*, 214; his admission of three types of illusion from three points of view, 241; his analysis of doubt, 211; his classification of doubt, 212-13; his conception of *jāti*, 355; his conception of *sādrśya*, 355; his criticism of Bhāskara, 301; his criticism of Brahmadatta, 291; his criticism of *Nyāya-sūtra* and *Prajñā-paritrāṇa* regarding doubt, 211; his criticism of Nyāya theory of doubt, 207; his criticism of Sāṃkhya argument in favour of *prakṛti*, 256 *et seq.*; his criticism of the *avidyā*, 330 *et seq.*; his criticism of the Sāṃkhya view of God, 296; his criticism of the Śaṅkara conception of the unity of self, 345; his criticism of the view that *ajñāna* is a positive entity, 327 *et seq.*; his criticism of the view that *ajñāna* rests in the individual *jīvas*, 320; his criticism of the view that all effects are false owing to their contradiction, 341 *et seq.*; his criticism of the view that *avidyā* and *māyā* are different, 334 *et seq.*; his criticism of the view that Brahman is pure bliss, 344; his criticism of the view that consciousness cannot be produced, 321; his criticism of the view that consciousness is identical with self, 323 *et seq.*; his criticism of the view that consciousness is one, 322; his criticism of the view that emancipation is attained by right knowledge, 326; his criticism of the view that indeterminate Brahman could be eternal, 345; his criticism of the view that pure consciousness is *sākṣin*, 325; his criticism of the view that pure consciousness is unqualified, 323; his criticism of the view that realization of monistic identity produces emancipation, 336 *et seq.*; his criticism of the view that scriptural testimony is superior to perception, 326; his criticism of the view that the notion of the self as knower is false, 325;

his criticism of the Yoga view of God, 296; his criticism of Yādava Prakāśa, 302; his definition of perception, 216; his doctrine of emancipation, 292; his eschatological conception, 295; his life and literature, 119-25; his Nyāya theory, refutation of, 262 *et seq.*; his relation of the view that consciousness is identical with self, 290; his refutation of Buddhist and Cārvāka theory of *ākāśa*, 282; his refutation of Buddhist doctrines of momentariness, 268 *et seq.*; his refutation of Cārvāka causality, 276; his refutation of contentless consciousness, 310-11; his refutation of different views of God, 302; his refutation of Kātyāyana's views of God, 302; his refutation of Sāṃkhya-satkāryavāda, 265 *et seq.*; his refutation of *nirvikalpapajñāna*, 311; his refutation of Śaṅkara, 304 *et seq.*; his refutation of Śaṅkara's theory of *anubhūti*, 318-19; his refutation of Śrīharṣa's refutation of *pramāṇa*, 202; his refutation of the denial of production of individual cognitions, 319 *et seq.*; his refutation of the Buddhist denial of substance, 251 *et seq.*; his refutation of the denial of the category of difference, 312; his refutation of the doctrine of the all-pervasiveness of souls, 291; his refutation of the falsity of the world on the ground of validity, 313-14; his refutation of the falsity of the world on the ground of absence of relation between the perceiver and the perceived, 314 *et seq.*; his refutation of the Nyāya doctrine of the formation of whole from parts, 263 *et seq.*; his refutation of the possibility of *jijñāsā* according to Śaṅkara's interpretation, 306; his refutation of the view of the reflection of Brahman under *avidyā*, 291; his refutation of the view that *avidyā* rests in Brahman, 317-18; his refutation of the view that perception refers to pure Being, 311; his refutation of the view that Brahman is qualityless, 306; his refutation of the view that the self-luminosity of Brahman is contentless, 316-17; his refutation of the view that the utterance of unity texts can lead to immediate perception, 308-10; his re-

- futation of the view that the world is illusory, 312-13; his special treatment of doubt, 207 *et seq.*; his support to the theory of *jñāna-karma-samuccaya*, 307; his support of the Vedic testimony, 203; his theory of consciousness, a quality of self, 288; his treatment of *avayava*, 232; his treatment of doubt, 202; his treatment of doubt compared with that of Varada Nārāyaṇa, 208; his treatment of inference, 225 *et seq.*; his treatment of *kevala-vyati-ṛekṇ*, 226-7; his treatment of memory as *pramāṇa*, 214; his treatment of object, 217; his treatment of *parāmarśa*, 229; his treatment of *pramāṇa*, 201 *et seq.*; his treatment of *śabda-pramāṇa*, 233; his treatment of substance, 251 *et seq.*; his treatment of *tarka*, 227; his treatment of types of inference, 229 *et seq.*; his treatment of *vyāptigraha*, 228; his treatment of *vyāpti*, 225-6; his view of *apūrva* or *adrṣṭa*, 303; his view of *bhakti*, 292 *et seq.*; his views of emancipation attainable by God's grace, 304; his view of God, 157 *et seq.*; his view of incarnation, 302-3; his view of *karma* and *mukti*, 295; his view of *karma* and *prāyaścitta*, 293-4; his view of matter, 162 *et seq.*; his view of *prakṛti*, *mahat*, *tanmātra*, etc., 163 *et seq.*; his view of self in relation to God, 161 *et seq.*; his view of the relation of the souls with God, 297; his view of validity of memory, 237; his view of virtue and vice, 291; his view that errors cannot vanish by Brahma-knowledge, 307; his view that world appearance continues even after the destruction of *avidyā*, 308; nature of *ākāśa*, 282; nature of the senses, 280 *et seq.*; nature of time, 284; nature of soul, 286 *et seq.*; offered a critic of Gotama's logic, 235; refutation of Cārvāka theory of soul, 286 *et seq.*; refutation of the view that consciousness belongs to the senses, 289; refutation of the view that scriptural texts cannot signify Brahman, 340; Śaṅkara's conception of cessation of *avidyā* criticized, 338 *et seq.*
- Veṅkaṭādaśa, 132  
Veṅkaṭa-deśika, 112
- Veṅkaṭanāthārya, 117  
Veṅkaṭa Sudhī, 12, 18, 132  
Veṅkaṭācārya, 112, 117  
Veṅkaṭādhvārī, 131, 132  
Veṅkaṭārya, 112  
Verbal knowledge, 216, 217, 308, 310  
Verbal testimony, 128  
Vernal, 295  
Verse, 117, 181  
*vibhava*, 39, 42, 129, 158  
*vibhava-avatāras*, 40 n.  
*vibhava-devatā*, 21  
*vibhavāvatāra*, 41  
*vibhu*, 262, 386  
*vibhūti*, 475  
Vibration, 206; potential, 163  
Vice, 291, 304, 349, 441, 493, 506, 521, 522, 533  
Vicious, 255, 267, 304, 349; circle, 419, 433; infinite, 9, 253, 267, 277, 286, 316, 320, 334, 341, 353, 355, 359, 417, 421, 424, 433; infinitude, 177 n.  
Victor, 78  
*Vidaddha*, 514 n.  
*Vidaddhavādī*, 514 n.  
*vidagdha*, 514 n.  
*videhī mukta*, 441  
*vidhī*, 8, 350  
*Vidhisudhākara*, 133  
Vidhura, 513  
*Vidhura-paṇḍita-jātaka*, 514 n.  
*vidyā*, 47, 49, 507, 508, 509  
Vidyāhideva, 40 n.  
Vidyānandī, 546, 547  
Vidyāpati, 3  
Vidyāpati Bhāskara Bhaṭṭa, 3  
Vidyāraṇya, 120  
*vidyā-yoni-śarīra*, 415  
View, 50, 56, 181, 182, 184, 185, 187, 192, 196, 204, 206, 289, 291, 297, 302, 303, 305, 307, 318, 330, 335, 349, 350, 409, 410, 429, 433, 435, 456, 458, 461, 469, 473, 477, 496, 498, 510, 512, 519, 520, 521, 522, 532, 533, 538  
*Vihagendra saṃhita*, 23, 24, 41, 57  
Vihāṅgama, 40 n.  
Vijayanagara, 120, 121  
*vijayā*, 57  
Vijayīndra, 127  
Vijayīndra Bhikṣu, 117  
*Vijayīndra-parājaya*, 127, 305  
*Vijayollāsa*, 126  
Vijñāna Bhikṣu, 445, 456, 480, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 493, 496, 497; his conception of the individual, 460 *et seq.*; his conception of the relation of the world with God, 454 *et seq.*

- Vijñāna Bhikṣu (*cont.*)  
 his criticism of Sāṃkhya and Yoga, 479 *et seq.*; his notion of God, 461; his philosophy, 445 *et seq.*; his treatment of *avidyā*, 468 *et seq.*; his treatment of *bhakti*, 450 *et seq.*; his treatment of Brahma experience, 465 *et seq.*; his treatment of experience, 467; his treatment of *karma*, 452 *et seq.*; his treatment of the nature of God, 474 *et seq.*; his treatment of the relation of Sāṃkhya to Vedānta, 471 *et seq.*; his view of gradation of realities, 445; his view of *karma*, 445; *kāla* in, 446; *māyā* and *pradhāna* in, 476 *et seq.*; relation of self and *ānanda* in, 445; world and Brahman in, 446 *et seq.*
- vijñānam*, 185 n.  
*vijñāna-vādin*, 142, 205  
*Vijñāna-mṛta-bhāṣya*, 450, 451 n., 453 n., 454 n., 455 n., 457 n., 458 n., 459 n., 461, 462 n., 463 n., 468 n., 472 n., 473 n., 477 n., 478 n., 480 n., 481 n., 482 n.
- Vikalpa, 4  
*vikāra*, 3, 260 n., 386, 480  
*Vikāra-veda*, 21  
*vikāri kārana*, 454  
*vikārin*, 61  
*vikarmasthān*, 518  
 Vikrama Cola, 104  
*vikriyātmaka*, 172  
*vikṛta*, 342  
*vikṛty-ātmā*, 25  
*vilakṣaṇa-mahatvā-dy-adhikaraṇatvād*, 257  
*Vimba-tattva-prakāśikā*, 122  
*vināśa*, 314  
 Viṇḍhyeśvarī Prasāda, referring to Vaiṣṇava commentators, 1 n.  
 Viṇḍhyeśvarī Prasāda Paṇḍita, 1 n., 2, 3 n.  
 Violation, 128  
*vipratipattiḥ*, 212 n., 213  
*vipura*, 503, 504  
 Virinchipuram, 523  
 Virōcana, 528  
*Virodha-bhāṇjam*, 384  
*Virodha-nirodha*, 115, 130, 384, 385, 386 n., 387, 392, 393 n., 394 n., 395  
*Virodha-parihāra*, 124  
*Virodha-varūthim*, 395, 396  
*Virodha-varūthim-pramāthim*, 130, 396  
 Virtues, 29, 33, 34, 47, 291, 294, 295, 303, 304, 349, 388, 441, 450, 493, 506, 521, 522, 530, 533, 549, 550
- Virtuous, 51, 295, 304, 349, 437, 549  
*viruddha-dharmā-dhyāsavān*, 268  
*utrut*, 500  
*Viṣṇūśolappillai*, 138  
 Visible, 5, 500  
 Vision, 71, 459; 471, 505  
 Visual, 543; organ, 222, 240, 241, 243, 459, 545; perception, 219, 310; sense, 217  
*viśadā-vabhāsa*, 217  
*viśeṣaṇa*, 429  
*viśiṣṭa-jñāna*, 221  
*Viśiṣṭā-dvaita*, 111, 116 n., 118, 119, 120, 123, 125, 159, 234, 235, 351, 389, 392, 393, 395  
*Viśiṣṭā-dvaita logic*, 234  
*Viśiṣṭā-dvaita-siddhānta*, 127  
*Viśiṣṭā-dvaitavāda*, 119  
*Viśiṣṭā-dvaitins*, 393  
*viśiṣṭārtha*, 233  
*viśiṣṭatva*, 218  
*viśuddhi*, 524  
*Viśva-guṇādarśa*, 131  
 Viśvajaya, 118  
 Viśvarūpa, 40 n.  
 Viśvācārya, 401  
*Viśvāmitra*, 23  
 Viśvāmitra gotra, 119  
*Viśvodarā*, 59  
*Viśayatā-vāda*, 133  
*Viśaya-vākya-dīpikā*, 117, 126  
 Viṣṇu, 12, 19, 20, 24, 25, 31, 33, 37, 38, 39, 40 n., 44, 45, 50, 52, 57, 58, 61, 63, 64, 66, 67 n., 68, 69, 87, 89, 96, 155, 304, 415, 448 n., 473, 475, 498, 499, 505, 507, 509  
 Viṣṇucitta, 69, 111, 119, 137, 214 n., 220 n., 234, 235, 383 n.; a predecessor of Venkṭa in the construction of Rāmānuja logic, 235  
 Viṣṇucittan, 63  
*Viṣṇudharmottara*, 20  
 Viṣṇu Miśra, 159  
*Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, 20, 81, 260 n., 497, 498 n., 499 n., 500, 501 n., 530; its philosophy, 497 *et seq.*  
*Viṣṇu-saṃhitā*, 23, 24, 31, 32; *ahamkāra* in, 31; *Bhāgavata-yoga* in, 32; *bhakti* and *yoga*, 32; God, nature of, 31; philosophy of, 23-4; *prakṛti*, theory of, 31; Sāṃkhya in, 23-4; *śāḍ-āṅga-yoga* in, 24; view of all-pervasive soul different from the Śrīvaiṣṇavas, 24  
*Viṣṇu-śakti*, 36  
*Viṣṇu-tattva-rahasya*, 132

- Viṣṇu-tattva-saṃhitā*, 22; its contents, 22  
*Viṣṇu-vardhana*, 104 n.  
 Viṣvaksena, 63 n., 64, 67 n.  
*Viṣvaksena-saṃhitā*, 24, 39, 41 n., 43, 56, 57; *vyūha* doctrine in, 39 n.  
 Vital energy, 462  
 Vital functions, 540  
 Vital spirit, 80  
*vitandā*, 512, 513, 514 n.  
*vitandā-sattha*, 514  
*vitandā-vāda-sattham*, 512  
*vivarta-paramparā*, 332  
*Vivādārtha-saṃgraha*, 132  
*viveka*, 449, 508  
 Vivid impression, 217  
 Vividness, 217  
*vīra*, 60  
 Viranārāyaṇa, 94  
*Vira-rāghava-dāsa*, 114, 116, 132, 352  
*virya*, 35, 37, 56  
 Void, 56  
 Volition, 298, 299  
 Volitional activity, 47  
*Vrajabhūṣaṇasaraṇadeva*, 402  
*vrata*, 33, 62  
*Vṛddha-manu*, 20  
*vṛddhi*, 47  
*Vṛhan-nāradya-purāṇa*, 20  
*urksa*, 500  
*Urksa-bhaumāmṛta*, 122  
*Vṛndāvana*, 94  
*Vṛndāvanadeva*, 402  
*virtti*, 105, 281, 372, 373, 374, 411, 423, 439, 465, 466, 471, 485, 494, 495  
*virtti-jñāna*, 204  
*virtti-kāra*, 105, 107, 108  
*virtti-kārasya*, 105 n.  
*virtti-nirodha*, 506 n.  
*virtti-prativimbitam*, 373  
*virtti* stage, 363  
 Vucci Veṅkaṭācārya, 132  
*vyakta*, 476, 497  
*vyaktā-vyakta*, 497, 508  
*vyakti*, 52  
*vyāṅga*, 265  
*vyāpya*, 225  
*vyatireki*, 230; inference, 230 n., 232; type, 231  
*vyatireki anumāna*, 231, 234  
*Vyavahārika-satyatva-khaṇḍana*, 125  
*vyavahārika*, 459, 477  
*vyavahārikatva*, 478  
*Vyavahārikatva-khaṇḍana-sāra*, 133  
*vyavahārikā*, 371  
*vyavahita*, 136  
*vyāhata-sādhyā-viparyayāt*, 229  
*vyākhyāna-maṇḍapa*, 137  
*vyāna*, 59, 60  
*vyāpaka*, 225  
*vyāpāra*, 204  
*vyāpti*, 225, 228, 427  
*Vyāsa*, 18 n., 20, 39, 482  
 Vyāsa Bhaṭṭār, 109 n.  
*Vyāsa-bhāṣya*, 452  
*Vyāsadeva*, 402  
*Vyāsa-tātparya-nirṇaya*, 133  
*Vyāsatiṛtha*, 111, 426  
*vyoma*, 31  
*vyūha*, 17, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 56, 157, 475; doctrine, 19; manifestations, 22  
 Waking consciousness, 363  
 Warangal, 120  
 Water, 42, 46, 128, 181, 369, 540, 541, 550  
 Waves, 6, 106, 302  
 Way of knowledge, 184  
 Ways, 60  
 Wedding, 377, 378  
 Western, 95  
 Wheel, 58, 60  
 Whirlpool, 83  
 White, 182, 256; goddess, 37  
 Whiteness, 193, 254  
 Whole, 189, 262, 263, 264, 298, 408, 413, 432, 433, 455, 456, 493, 494, 542  
 Will, 41, 45, 46, 48, 49, 191, 295, 298, 375, 412, 415, 441, 446, 448, 454, 472, 473, 474, 475, 481, 482, 488, 498, 500 n., 525  
 Will-activity, 45  
 Wisdom, 33, 38, 54, 307, 384, 414, 416, 446, 476, 491, 514, 521  
 Wise, 53  
 Wish, 54, 192, 295  
 Women, 20  
 Wonderful entity, 79  
 Words, 5, 29, 53, 61, 194, 309, 318  
 Work, 42, 46, 53, 56, 60, 303, 350  
 World, 6, 27, 34, 35, 41, 42, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 153, 174, 190, 191, 192, 193, 195, 196, 198 n., 200, 205, 293, 299, 301, 302, 312, 313, 314, 320, 321, 350, 365, 366, 388, 390, 391, 397, 413, 415, 416, 435, 438, 440, 442, 443 n., 445, 446, 456, 457, 458, 472, 476, 482, 488, 515, 517, 518, 531; of effects, 256; of matter, 200; view of its falsity refuted from the Nimbārka point of view, 435 et seq.

- World-appearance, 155, 175, 177, 178, 196, 197, 210, 239, 307, 308, 309, 310, 312, 313, 331, 335, 337, 345, 367, 409, 423, 436, 439
- World-creation, 296, 302, 330, 331, 365, 370
- World-creator, 462
- World-energy, 58, 459
- World-existence, 490
- World-experience, 374
- World-force, 24
- World-forms, 37, 456
- World-illusion, 333, 337, 338
- Worldly bonds, 22
- Worldly objects, 258
- World-materials, 152
- World-objects, 367, 371
- World-order, 197
- World-phenomena, 155, 196, 340
- World-process, 292, 458, 477
- World-reality, 157
- Worship, 10, 22, 32, 39, 40 n., 58, 61, 104, 193; of God, 382
- Wretchedness, 99
- Writers, 111, 196
- Wrongful, 180
- yad-ārtha-vyavahārā-nuṣṇā*, 244
- Yajñamūrti, 102, 104, 109, 110
- Yajña Varāha, 40 n.
- Yajñeśa, 102, 110
- Yajñopavīta-pratiṣṭhā*, 122
- yama, 29, 33, 61, 509 n., 519
- Yama samkīrtas, 20
- Yamunācārya, his life and works, 97 et seq.
- Yasasvint, 59
- Yasodā, 77, 84 n.
- yathārtha, 180, 188
- yathārtha-khyāti, 180, 181, 182, 186 n., 237, 240, 243, 245, 246 n.
- yathārtham, 185 n.
- yathārthā-vadhārāṇam, 62
- yathā - vāsthita - vyavahārā - nuṣṇam, 236, 240
- Yati-dharma-samuccaya, 102 n.
- Yati-līṅga-samarthana, 352
- Yati-pati-mala-dīpikā, 127
- Yati-prativandana-khaṇḍana, 133
- Yati-rāja-vimśati, 137, 138
- Yatīśekhara-bhārata, 109
- Yatindra-mata-dīpikā, 117, 127, 128; analysis of, 128, 129
- Yatindrapravāṇa, 110, 121 n., 137
- Yatindra-pravāṇa-bhādra-campu, 138
- Yatindra-pravāṇa-prabhāva, 138
- Yatindra-pravāṇa-prabhāvam, 64
- Yatindrapravapācārya, 135
- yaugapādya, 228
- Yavanas, 441 n.
- yavanti, 47
- Yādava, 100 n., 191
- Yādava hill, 22
- Yādavaprakāśa, 100, 101, 102, 109, 113, 124, 156, 201, 280, 285, 301, 305; his view of Brahman, 301; his view of God, 156; his view of time, 285
- Yādavābhhyudaya, 120, 121
- Yādavādri, 104, 137
- Yādycchika-ppadi, 135 n.
- Yajñavalkya, 519
- Yajñavalkya-smṛti, 484
- Yāmuna, 14, 16, 17, 18, 79, 85, 95, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 105, 108, 109, 113, 114, 123, 139, 140, 142, 152, 153, 154, 155, 157, 159, 227, 235; Cārvāka's criticism of soul, 139; his disciples, 109; his general position, 139; his theory of self, 140; his view of God, p. 152 et seq.
- Yāmuna's philosophy, 140
- Yāmunaācārya, 97, 139, 229 n.
- Yellow, 182, 254
- Yoga, 18, 22, 24, 30, 31, 32, 33, 52, 60, 61, 62, 80, 96, 97, 100, 157, 220, 281 n., 446, 449, 459, 465, 468, 471, 473, 474, 479, 480, 481, 482, 487, 491, 496, 506, 509, 512
- yoga-bhakti, 507
- Yoga processes, 479
- Yoga-rahasya, 96
- Yoga-sūtra, 61 n., 62 n., 470, 473, 482
- Yoga-vārttika, 482
- Yoga-view, 296
- yogānuśāsana, 62
- Yogic knowledge, 214
- Yogic practice, 28
- Yogin, 27, 30, 31, 42, 58, 60, 62, 96, 152, 446, 491, 506, 538
- yogi-pratyakṣa, 168, 189
- Yogivāha, 63
- yogi, 505
- yoni, 46, 502

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY  
W. LEWIS, M.A.  
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS